

JOB FUNCTIONS AND JOB SATISFACTION OF
STATE SCHOOL GUIDANCE CONSULTANTS

By

MARGARET L. CLICK

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1986

Dedicated to
My Husband, Dewitt Ernest Click

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation and thanks go to the following special people: Dr. Robert Myrick for his patience, compassion, encouragement, direction, and tactful commentaries; Dr. Janet Larsen for her constant enthusiastic support and reassurance; Dr. Robert Jester for his dependable guidance and calming sense of humor; Billie Jackson for her suggestions, encouragement, and friendship; My Mom, Grace Lawton, for her unquestioning support and love; My Pop, Forest Lawton, for his constant love and reinforcement, who was not surprised by what I accomplished; My Husband, Ernie, for all the patience, trust, support, and enduring love that are always there for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT	xi
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
The Need for the Study	4
DOE Consultant Leadership/Management Functions	6
DOE Consultant Consultation Functions	6
DOE Consultant Research Functions	7
DOE Consultant Professional Develop- ment Functions	8
Job Satisfaction	9
Summary	9
The Purpose of the Study	11
Research Questions	12
Definition of Terms	12
Organization of the Study	14
II A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	15
Historical Perspective: Guidance and Counseling	17
The Federal Government's Influence	18
State Department of Education	22
DOE Pupil Personnel Services	26
Pupil Personnel: Guidance and Counsel- ing Division	27
DOE School Guidance Consultants	31
DOE Consultant Role Studies	34
Subjects of Interest for a Role Study	38
General Profile	38

	Role Areas and Specific Job Functions of Interest	39
	Degrees of Job Satisfaction	46
	Role Study Evaluation	50
	Importance	51
	Time Spent	52
	Effectiveness	53
	Future Trend	54
	Summary	55
III	METHODOLOGY	59
	Population	59
	Development of the Questionnaire	61
	The Questionnaire	62
	Pilot Study	69
	Instructions and Printing	70
	Hypotheses	70
	Leadership/Management	71
	Consultation	72
	Research	72
	Professional Development	73
	Data Analyses	74
	Research Procedures	74
	Phase One: The List	74
	Phase Two: The Questionnaire	75
	Phase Three: The Mail-Out	75
	Phase Four: The Follow-Up	76
	Phase Five: The Data Collection	76
	Phase Six: Data Analyses	77
IV	RESULTS	78
	Descriptive Data	80
	General Profile	80
	Leadership/Management Job Functions	87
	Consultation Job Functions	100
	Research Job Functions	107
	Professional Development Job Functions	118
	Assigned Functions	128

CHAPTER

Page

Comparisons of Data	129
Leadership/Management Role Function Ratings as a Function of Job Satis- faction	134
Consultation Role Function Ratings as a Function of Job Satisfaction	138
Research Role Function Ratings as a Function of Job Satisfaction	142
Professional Development Role Function Ratings as a Function of Job Satis- faction	146
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	151
Summary	151
Conclusions	152
Section 1: General Profile	152
Job Function Profile of the DOE Con- sultants to School Guidance and Counseling	154
Profile of Assigned Responsibilities	158
Influence of Job Satisfaction on Job Function Ratings	159
Summary of Conclusions	161
Limitations	162
Implications	163
General National Profile	163
Leadership/Management Job Functions	164
Consultation Job Functions	166
Research Job Functions	167
Professional Development Job Functions	168
Job Satisfaction	169
Recommendations	169
Summary Statement	172

APPENDICES

A QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER	176
B THE HERR STUDY	187
C SCHOOL COUNSELORS, STUDENT ENROLLMENTS AND RATIOS	191
D STATE GUIDANCE CONSULTANTS DIRECTORY	195

	<u>Page</u>
REFERENCES	208
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	214

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. DOE Consultant Age, Salary, and Years of Experience	82
2. DOE Consultant Sex and National Professional Memberships	82
3. Highest Educational Degree Held by DOE Consultants	82
4. State Titles for DOE Consultants to School Guidance and Counseling	84
5. DOE Consultants' Areas of Specialization by Frequencies	88
6. Leadership/Management Job Functions by Importance Ratings	90
7. Leadership/Management Job Functions by Time Spent Ratings	92
8. Leadership/Management Job Functions by Effectiveness Ratings	95
9. Leadership/Management Job Functions by Future Trends Ratings	98
10. Consultation Job Functions by Importance	101
11. Consultation Job Functions by Time Spent Ratings	102
12. Consultation Job Functions by Effectiveness Ratings	105
13. Consultation Job Functions by Future Trends Ratings	106
14. Research Job Functions by Importance	108
15. Research Job Functions by Time Spent Ratings	110

TablePage

16.	Research Job Functions by Effectiveness Ratings	112
17.	Research Job Functions by Future Trends Ratings	114
18.	Professional Development Job Functions by Importance	119
19.	Professional Development Job Functions by Time Spent Ratings	121
20.	Professional Development Job Functions by Effectiveness Ratings	123
21.	Professional Development Job Functions by Future Trends Ratings	125
22.	Total Assigned Job Functions in Each of the Four Roles for the DOE Consultants as Indicated by Completed Questionnaires	130
23.	Distribution Levels of Job Satisfaction	133
24.	Analysis of Variance Summaries for Leadership/ Management Functions	135
25.	Means of Job Satisfaction Groups in Leadership/ Management Role x Categorical Variables	136
26.	Analysis of Variance Summaries for Consultation Job Functions	139
27.	Means of Job Satisfaction Groups in Consultation x Categorical Variables	140
28.	Analysis of Variance Summaries for Research Functions	143
29.	Means of Job Satisfaction Groups in Research x Categorical Variables	144
30.	Analysis of Variance Summaries for Professional Development Functions	147
31.	Means of Job Satisfaction Groups in Research x Categorical Variables	148

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

JOB FUNCTIONS AND JOB SATISFACTION OF
STATE SCHOOL GUIDANCE CONSULTANTS

By

Margaret L. Click

August 1986

Chairman: Dr. Robert M. Myrick
Major Department: Counselor Education

The purpose of this study was to describe and clarify
the role of state department of education (DOE) school
guidance consultants. The study proposed to answer the
following three questions:

1. What is the national profile of the DOE consultant
to school guidance and counseling?
2. How do the DOE consultants perceive their role
responsibilities as delineated by specific job
functions in terms of importance, time spent,
effectiveness, and future trends?
3. Does the DOE consultants' level of job satisfac-
tion affect their perceptions of their job func-
tions in their four major roles?

A survey questionnaire was sent to the DOE consultants who had school guidance supervision assigned to them. Seventy-two consultants from 44 states responded.

The data indicated only nine job functions were agreed upon by more than 60% of the consultants to be important and effective, with predicted continued emphasis in their future roles. Thirty job functions were not clearly defined as part of their work. The identification and clarification of the DOE consultants' role merit continued examination because of the variations in role perceptions reported by the individual respondents in this study.

The researcher tested by analysis of variance 16 null hypotheses regarding the effect of three levels of job satisfaction on the mean categorical ratings concerning the job functions in the four major roles of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development. Of the 16 null hypotheses, nine were rejected with $\alpha = .05$.

Significant differences in the mean categorical ratings of job functions were found between high and low levels and medium and low levels of job satisfaction in all four roles. These differences were determined through the use of the Tukey studentized range (Honestly Significant Difference) test for each categorical variable. Therefore, satisfied consultants may see their job functions differently from those with low levels of job satisfaction.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Within the past few years, there has been an increased public awareness of the problems facing education. The pursuit of educational excellence has become a challenge in almost every state and community. If schools are to be more successful in preparing young people, effective leadership and management are needed at local, state and national levels.

This study presents a profile of the leadership provided at the state department levels. The personal, social, and career development of students, especially as related to their academic progress, is a national and statewide concern. School counselors and teachers provide guidance services and they depend upon assistance from guidance administrators, coordinators, supervisors, and consultants.

In addition to leaders in their local school systems, school counselors rely on people who hold responsible positions in professional organizations, colleges and universities, and state departments of education. Leadership is needed from all these sources in order to strengthen

the nation's pursuit of educational excellence (Heddesheimer, 1978).

In general, school counselors and teachers first look to their local leaders for assistance in program management and then to their state department of education (DOE). Every state has a DOE. State departments of education (DOEs) were established in every state to help administer the educational laws of their respective states and to interpret the policies of the state boards of education. The DOEs seem to have two main functions--regulation and leadership (Grieder & Romine, 1965). Also, they provide important leadership through educational planning, research, school and district visitations, and consultation (Warner, 1969).

All states employ DOE consultants who are given various duties and responsibilities, such as developing and writing programs, leading in-service workshops, and monitoring and evaluating projects. But states differ regarding structure, personnel assignments, priorities, and the number of DOE consultants assigned to school guidance and counseling.

A study cited in Heddesheimer (1978) and a study conducted by Herr (1971) described the influential leadership and support roles of the DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling. They used other terms to refer to the DOE consultant. These other terms are personnel supervisors, directors, administrators, coordinators, and specialists. They have been an essential part of the history

of the guidance function in our schools (Heddesheimer, 1978).

In order to receive federal funds to establish and to maintain the operation of the guidance and counseling division, the DOE guidance and counseling staffs are required by law to write state plans based on objectives determined by assessed needs in each of their respective states (Hill, 1974). These guidance plans and programs were required by federal law under the enactment of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. Another important piece of legislation, Title III, Part D, of the NDEA (Public Law 94-482), extended these services and placed the responsibility for supervision in the hands of the DOE consultants to guidance and counseling (Heddesheimer, 1978).

Guidance and counseling consultants have a myriad of responsibilities (Heddesheimer, 1978). They communicate regularly with legislators, school counselors, district supervisors, parents, and federal officials. They conduct research and set guidelines for accountability studies. They also have the responsibility to develop and conduct professional staff development workshops.

In brief, the current challenges to the counseling profession require competent, informed, and resourceful action by the DOE consultants to ensure that the greatest number of students, teachers, counselors, supervisors, and parents receives the most appropriate services in terms of effective guidance programs. Educational structures (the

various state DOE's) have been created to enable each state to discharge its diverse educational services. Within the DOE organizational structures are the specialized divisions, agencies, or bureaus that have jurisdiction over the guidance and counseling functions.

The Need for the Study

A review of the professional literature has indicated that DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling have recognized leadership positions in the school counseling profession (Dentler, 1984; Erpenbach, 1977; Eye, 1975; Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971; Herr, 1971; Warner, 1969). But there are no published studies that evaluate the leadership responsibilities of the DOE consultants. The DOE consultant leadership role needs to be evaluated (Cunningham, 1985; Eye, 1975).

Most DOE guidance and counseling consultants are responsible for statewide coordination, consultation, research, and professional development services that are to be provided to school counselors (Herr, 1971). As the DOE consultants' roles have become more complex because of added dimensions and responsibilities, some questions are being raised concerning their most important functions (Wantz, Corvin, & Hollis, 1985). Where is the most time spent? Other questions are asked about what school counselors, district supervisors, parents, and students have a right to expect of consultants and what consultants in the DOE can do

for these groups. In order to answer these and other questions the roles and job functions of DOE consultants need to be clarified. There is no research in the professional literature which has examined the DOE consultants' job functions in terms of importance, time demands, effectiveness, and future trends.

State consultants to school guidance and counseling are subject to a variety of demands. They respond to different interest groups (e.g., other consultants, supervisors, school board members, counselors, district supervisors, government officials, parents); serve on committees; act as teachers, supervisors, and administrators; and they must work well with other people to accomplish their goals. These demands cause pressure which affects their degree of job satisfaction and creates feelings of role conflict and ambiguity. Role conflict and role ambiguity are two psychological strains that have been linked to job satisfaction (Jackson, 1983). But there are no reports in the professional literature that evaluate the job satisfaction of the DOE personnel who are consultants in school guidance and counseling.

Role studies are designed to determine the functions persons are expected to serve in meeting the responsibilities of a given position of employment. Almost every professional role in education has been reviewed and evaluated (Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971). However, Gade and Zaccaria (1966) requested more articles be written about the role of

state consultants to school guidance and counseling. Since their request, only a few studies have been conducted (Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971; Herr, 1971; Wantz, Corvin, & Hollis, 1985; Warner, 1969). There are no published studies that examine the consultants' job functions regarding importance, time, effectiveness, future trends, and job satisfaction.

DOE Consultant Leadership/Management Functions

According to Watts (1981), leadership is critical if the goals and objectives of an organizational system are to be met. He suggested specific areas of general activity for effective school guidance leadership, one of which was decision-making ability.

Decision-making power is needed to manage a state program (Eye, 1975). There are no studies in the professional literature which clarify the decision-making power and effectiveness of the DOE consultants. Do they set priorities in the management of their assigned functions? These are unanswered questions in studies of DOE consultants.

DOE Consultant Consultation Functions

Another assigned role for state level guidance consultants is the consultation service (Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971). In this role the consultants work as facilitators, problem-analysts, and/or problem-solvers. Many school counselors,

district supervisors, and other coworkers often seek assistance, resources, or information from the consultants. Do the consultants have the time to spend with those who need this help? Or, are they isolated from local school districts and state-wide concerns?

How important is the role of consultation? What influence does job satisfaction have on consultants? Is the consultant role predicted to increase in the future? There are no published studies which have been conducted to evaluate the consultation role.

DOE Consultant Research Functions

The need for DOE consultants to conduct research has been supported (Fitzpatrick, 1967; Shertzer & Stone, 1974). Accountability of guidance programs is a nationwide concern in education (Schmidt, 1984). School counselors need to develop specific observable goals that reflect the numbers of students to be reached, the type of services to be offered, and the time during the school year in which specific activities are scheduled (Schmidt, 1984).

Statewide counseling programs are based on organized plans. Strong leadership in facilitating and evaluating these plans is necessary to "pull together" an effective statewide program (Heyden & Pohlmann, 1981). State consultants try to provide the resources for a statewide communication network and they often act as facilitators in the development of guidance programs. Do the DOE consultants

function as research facilitators? Is the research process a priority for state consultants? Or is their time too fragmented to allow them to conduct accountability studies? On the other hand, do they feel overburdened with tasks of questionable research activities?

Fitzpatrick (1967) expressed a concern for the lack of state-level research, and the continued dearth implies little attention has been paid to his concern. How do the state consultants feel about conducting research at the state level? If research is conducted, what issues should be researched? Does job satisfaction affect the research activities of the DOE consultants?

DOE Consultant Professional Development Functions

The role of professional staff development is often mentioned in the job description for the DOE consultants. Some related professional development activities include liaison functions to the legislators and their staff, and to the DOE staff. Also included are the planning and coordination of in-service workshops for local district school counselors and supervisors.

However, with the drop in services to counselor education programs reported by Wantz, Covin, and Hollis (1985), is the professional training of school counselors a job function of DOE consultants? How important is professional development of counselors to consultants? Do they have the time to spend in this area?

Many state guidelines for the counseling profession rely on tests for the initial licensing or credentialing process. Most tests are required to assess continued competence, provide licensing, or to issue speciality certification. Do state DOE consultants disseminate information on counselor certification or licensing to the state school district or statewide workshops on the certification, licensing, or professional development of school counselors?

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an important factor to be evaluated in a role study of the DOE guidance consultants. How do consultants feel about the many responsibilities of their job?

Researchers have postulated that a relationship may exist between the work role and its associated job functions, behaviors, and attitudes (Tharenou & Harker, 1982). Performance level of employees has been related to the amount of job complexity and satisfaction (Kasl & French, 1962). Therefore, the job satisfaction felt by the DOE guidance consultants may be an important determinant of their behaviors toward their many job functions.

Summary

All facets of public education emphasize the need for competent and informed leadership in the educational system (Ornstein, 1985). The current pursuit of excellence in

education has produced a number of reports and pending reforms for major changes in the present system (e.g., The American High School: Time for Reform, 1982; Educating Americans for the 21st Century, 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Task Force on Education, 1983; Twentieth Century Fund Task Force, 1983).

Competent, active, effective leadership in school counseling is needed to unify, direct, and support school counselors' efforts in the pursuit of excellence in education. The leadership may be found in several areas, but one significant place is at the state DOE level. However, there have been no attempts to evaluate this leadership position.

If the DOE school guidance consultants have four typical roles (leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development) is it not important to know what priorities are placed on these roles? Are these priorities not a good source of information about the status and direction of the school counseling profession in each state and nation? There have been no studies reported in the professional journals on any of these roles.

Job satisfaction may directly influence the priorities and behaviors of DOE consultants in their roles. Does their level of job satisfaction have an influence on perceptions of their roles and job functions? Again, there have been no studies of job satisfaction and its possible effect on DOE consultants' roles.

The need exists for a clarification and an evaluation of the roles of the DOE school guidance consultants.

Erpenbach summarized the problem in 1977:

When all is said and done, very little is known about state supervisors . . . (outside of their own circle). They are: few in number; lacking a recognized place in the literature let alone a preparation curriculum--one doesn't set out to be a state supervisor and is often ill prepared for the role; designated an "interest area" of ACES; alleged to be influential; rarely trained to "supervise"; recognized in federal law; and charged with broad responsibilities concerning the preparation of and work of school counselors in the public schools of the nation. (p. 307)

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe and clarify the role of DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling. More specifically, DOE consultants from the 50 DOEs in the U.S. were asked to provide information as a basis for

1. a description of the DOE consultants in terms of education, experience, age, salary, professional activities, and job satisfaction as reflected by working conditions;
2. a description of the DOE consultants' perceptions of their job functions in the four major role responsibilities of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development, with each related job function assessed in terms of importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends; and

3. a comparison of the DOE consultants' perceptions of their job functions in the four major role responsibilities with their feelings of job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The following questions received special attention:

1. What is the national profile of the DOE consultant to school guidance and counseling?
2. How do the DOE consultants perceive their role responsibilities as delineated by specific job functions in terms of importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends?
3. Does the DOE consultants' degree of job satisfaction affect their perceptions of their job functions in their four major roles?

Definition of Terms

Consultant consultation role--A series of job functions that designates the role of problem-solver, analyzer, counselor, clarifier, and facilitator.

Consultant leadership/management role--A series of job functions that designates the role of decision-maker, organizer, speaker, and coordinator.

Consultant professional development role--A series of job functions that designates the role of participant in

professional organizations, program developer, and liaison to universities and legislatures.

Consultant research and accountability role--A series of job functions that designates the role of writer, data collector, reporter, investigator, data disseminator, and evaluator.

Effectiveness--The successful, productive, influential, and/or useful determinations that result from the DOE consultant's work.

Future trend--A forecast, prediction, or projection of future emphasis for the DOE consultants' job function.

Importance--Essential, meaningful, significant, or influential work that may be prioritized.

In-service program--A program of educational activities that contributes to professional growth and competencies.

Job function--A specific part of a major role responsibility that describes one related task or duty.

Job satisfaction--The feelings of gratification and personal pleasure one determines as a result of an assessment of the degree the working conditions meet the individual's needs.

Professional counseling organization--An association (local, state, regional, and national) directed to the common good of school counseling; it may include divisions which serve other professional groups such as higher education and community agencies to promote and

stimulate the exchange of ideas and to enhance the professional competencies of the members.

Role or role responsibility--A series of related job functions which provide a professional service.

State department of education (DOE)--A state government organization with statewide jurisdiction established by law to carry out part of the educational responsibilities of the state--it may be composed of a state board and/or chief executive officer (superintendent) and staff; the DOE is the state level office from which the guidance and counseling consultant receives direction and support for any job functions performed.

State DOE consultant to school guidance and counseling--A professional staff member of a state DOE who is engaged in the professional roles of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development to serve the state population of school counselors and supervisors. The consultant is sometimes referred to as the guidance administrator, coordinator, facilitator, specialist, supervisor, or school guidance consultant.

Time spent--The amount of time used for specific job functions in terms of daily, weekly, monthly or yearly attention.

Organization of the Study

The remainder of this investigation is organized in the following manner. A review of the related literature appears in Chapter II. In Chapter III, the details of the study's methodology are presented. The results of the study appear in Chapter IV. The summary, conclusions, limitations, implications, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

There is a paucity of literature about DOE state consultants to school counseling. A few journal articles briefly describe some of the consultants' roles and functions and list some general trends. There is a need for a more in-depth study in these areas.

One article, which pointed out the need for a role study of the DOE school counseling consultants, was a 1971 study by Geoffroy and Duncan, entitled "A Factor Analysis of the Role of the State Supervisors of Guidance Services." The factor analysis produced three major categories for the state guidance supervisors' role: promotion, service, and noninvolvement. Related job functions were listed under each of the three categories for the role. No further analysis was attempted.

Herr (1971) studied national groups of school counselors, counselor educators, and state supervisors and found consensus among the groups on specific job functions as the responsibility of a state guidance staff. Again, no further analysis was attempted.

Erpenbach (1977) discussed the relationship of state supervisors of guidance and counseling to counselor

educators. He suggested that articles about university counselor educators and their decision-making roles have dominated the literature, while the roles of state supervisors were ignored. He recommended that counselor educators work together with state supervisors to provide leadership to the counseling profession.

Wantz and his colleagues wrote the only current article about the role and functions of state DOE staff for guidance and counseling. Their study was conducted to obtain information about the changes in roles and functions from 1980 through 1983. From these changes the authors suggested some trends and implications for the future role responsibilities of state consultants which included added responsibilities with no staff increases (Wantz, Corvin, & Hollis, 1985).

None of the studies developed a profile of the state consultants' role responsibilities. None of the researchers investigated the relationship of the degree of job satisfaction to the DOE consultant's role.

The review of the literature is presented in eight sections in this chapter. The first section is an examination of the historical perspective of the guidance and counseling functions. The second describes the federal government's influence in aid to the school counseling profession. The third section is a description of the development and functions of state DOEs. The fourth and fifth sections describe and review the state consultants' roles and related job functions. Section six is a report on the variables of

interest in this role study, and section seven is a report on the evaluation categories used in the study. Section eight is the summary of Chapter II.

Historical Perspective: Guidance and Counseling

For thousands of years life-adjustment and vocational-type guidance was probably a natural everyday process in the life of the family. The typical family provided nearly all the guidance its children received.

Venn (1964) pointed out that when adult work was relatively unspecialized or undifferentiated, the vocational aspects of guidance, if it could be called guidance, were usually performed by parents. The son followed in the footsteps of the father and the daughter was trained in the domestics. This guidance was apparently adequate in meeting the vocational needs of youth and in satisfying the vocational demands of society in years past. Life adjustment problems were dealt with by each family.

Aubrey (1982) observed that the upheaval and change in society brought about by the Industrial Revolution of the mid- to late-1800s created new problems for young people. Faced with many more occupational opportunities and the need for specialization in order to obtain and to succeed in a job, many of the young found it increasingly more difficult to choose and prepare for a vocation. A problem that had been primarily a family concern gradually became an issue for consideration in planning school curricula.

Venn (1964) also noted that large cities, being the centers for industrial life, became the locations for the beginnings of organized guidance. The area of vocational guidance provided the initial impetus to the total guidance and counseling functions in our schools.

Researchers generally consider 1900-1910 as the time that vocational guidance had entered the U.S. public schools (Aubrey, 1982). Humphreys and Traxler (1954) further noted that in the 10-year period between the first attempts at organized guidance and the entry of the United States into World War I, some 50 high schools had launched tentative or experimental programs of guidance.

Other influences important to the development of guidance services during this time period were the establishment of professional organizations, the testing and measurement movement, the introduction of cumulative records, and the growing interest of professional groups in the improvement in training of personnel in their respective fields (Humphreys & Traxler, 1954). The federal government also began to play a role in the development of guidance services in the public schools.

The Federal Government's Influence

The federal government formed some landmark legislation which played a major role in the development of the state school counseling functions. One of the most influential

measures of federal control over guidance in the states was enacted with the passage of the Smith Hughes Act of 1917 (Grieder & Romine, 1965). It was designed to permanently aid vocational education. Specifically, Congress authorized almost \$2 million to promote vocational education and home economics training in the public schools. This money was the first annual federal appropriation for specific instruction at the high school level. The act also created the Federal Board for Vocational Education and required the states to have state vocational guidance plans (Burke, 1951).

The George-Reed Act of 1920 and the George-Elzy Act of 1934 added more funding to the vocational education of the public schools (Herr, 1985). The George-Dean Act of 1936 followed and doubled the appropriations to \$4 million for the establishment of guidance staff positions in the state DOEs. Ten years later, the George-Barden Act of 1946 broadened federal support again for the development of state supervisory programs by providing funds for the creation and maintenance of state supervision, for reimbursement of salaries for counselor educators, and for research in the field of guidance (Udell, 1966).

State after state officially began to recognize the crucial role of guidance in the schools (Warner, 1969). Each state set up a division of guidance services within the DOE and provided a state supervisor. By 1954, 44 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories of Hawaii,

Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands each had a guidance supervisor in the state DOE (Warner, 1969).

More federal money followed. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA) provided over \$102 million to improve guidance programs in the secondary schools and it made possible a change of the counselor-student ratio from 1:900 to 1:540 (Tiedt, 1966). The Vocational Education Act (VEA) of 1963 provided annual grants of \$225 million to revamp the Smith Hughes Act of 1917. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) authorized \$1.33 billion to assist schools with large enrollments from low income families. More school counselors and supervisors were provided from these funds but the year to year growth was never documented.

Up to the time that President Reagan took office, the history of federal aid for education, which included guidance and counseling funds, was one of targeting special populations with a proliferation of categorical programs (Henderson, 1986). During the 15 years that followed the ESEA of 1965, funding for such special aid programs as Title I (compensatory education for disadvantaged children), P.L. 94-142 (education for handicapped children), and bilingual education grew to \$4.8 billion. During the same period, the federal government created a myriad of smaller, competitive grant programs directed to aid such special causes as consumer education, ethnic heritage studies,

career education, and education of the gifted and talented (Henderson, 1986).

The implementation of many of these programs was the responsibility of the individual guidance counselors, whose numbers increased also during this time (National Data Book and Guide to Sources, 1984). Each program had its own application cycle, set of guidelines, and funding procedures. When examined in their entirety, the programs produced a complex puzzle for the states to untangle.

Simplification of the federal aid puzzle came in 1981 with the enactment of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. This act had two major parts: Chapter 1, which was a streamlined version of Title I, and Chapter 2, which was a block grant that consolidated about 28 programs (Henderson, 1986). The big programs for handicapped children, vocational education, and bilingual education were not included and have generally remained unchanged.

The block grant of Chapter 2 provides funds for the guidance and counseling services at the state and local level. The funds are determined by a formula based on the school age population of each state (Henderson, 1986). The state DOEs may reserve up to 20% of these funds for state programs, but the remaining 80% must be distributed to local districts through a formula of the state DOEs construction but based on student enrollment.

The three different types of programs contained in Chapter 2 are (a) Basic Skills Development; (b) Improvement

and Support Services, which includes guidance, counseling and testing among other services; and (c) Special Projects, which includes gifted and talented education, career education, community education, and ethnic heritage studies. The flexible administrative responsibility of Chapter 2 has provided the individual state DOE's with more local autonomy (Henderson, 1986).

Throughout the history of federal involvement with education and more specifically with guidance and counseling much attention has been given to maintaining individual state control of money and programs. All of the cited legislation channeled federal money into guidance and counseling through the states' DOE's. As a result, all 50 states and the District of Columbia have guidance departments within the DOE organizational structure. However, there are a few states (e.g., Alaska and Arizona) that apparently do not have appointed school guidance consultants in their DOE's (Wantz, Corvin, & Hollis, 1985).

State Departments of Education

Historically, education has been left to each state to develop, manage, and administer rather than to the federal government. This policy has led to the development of state boards of education and to the employment of state superintendents and supporting staffs in the DOE's.

The state DOE's were probably begun in New York State after the Revolutionary War. The state government was

faced with the problem of administering the colleges and academies authorized prior to this time by the King of England. To solve this problem, the state legislature authorized, in 1784, the Board of Regents of the State of New York (Warner, 1969).

The New York legislature in 1812 became the first state to pass a law providing for the appointment of a state superintendent of common schools. But the first holder of the office, Gideon Hawley (1785-1870), was removed from office by the politicians, and the office was abolished (Wilds, 1936).

Maryland in 1826, Michigan in 1829, and eight other states between 1830 and 1839 made provisions for an office similar to that of the New York State Superintendent. Other states in the ensuing time had established some form of a department of education. The official U.S. Office of Education records indicated that by 1850, DOE's had been established in 24 states and territories. Not until the passage of the NDEA of 1958 did all of the states establish and maintain DOE's and state superintendents (Warner, 1969).

The superintendent of education is the state board's executive who is responsible for carrying out the duties given him or her by the state board or by law. These duties include putting into effect the policies adopted by the board. The superintendent delegates the actual work to the appropriate divisions of the state DOE's. In this way the superintendent works through the education department in

conjunction with the school districts, the school systems, and the higher education institutions. Thus, the superintendent is usually not the person who has the most direct contact with local personnel; rather DOE staff are assigned to implement programs, policies, and meet with district personnel.

The DOE staff work under the direction of the state superintendent in two major functions--regulatory and leadership (Grieder & Romine, 1965). According to Grieder and Romine (1965), the regulatory function serves at least the following five purposes:

1. Protection of children's lives and health;
2. Assurance of safety and prudence in the use of school funds;
3. Promotion of efficiency in educational management . . . ;
4. Maintenance and improvement of at least a reasonably satisfactory basic program of instruction throughout the state;
5. Development of an educated citizenry through enforcement of compulsory attendance laws. . . . (p. 413)

Grieder and Romine (1965) listed the leadership function of the DOE to serve at least five purposes:

1. Planning
2. Research
3. Advice and consultation
4. Coordination
5. Fostering constructive relations between the state school system and the people of the state, especially their elected representatives in the legislature. (p. 413)

The DOE staff serves in various important leadership capacities to fulfill these functions. The members of the staff are responsible for educational planning to meet the needs of the students in all geographic areas of the state.

Many of the staff members go to individual schools and districts for visitations, audits, and consultation on educational improvements (Grieder & Romine, 1965).

According to Dentler (1984), most state constitutions and state board charters give state DOE's more authority than the DOE's exercise. But, the Council of Chief State School Officer's 1983 statement emphasized that many essential functions of DOE's and state boards have yet to be clearly delegated by state legislature (Dentler, 1984).

Dentler's study (1984) found that DOE staffs generally confine themselves to their own states and essentially work within the state capitals. Definite restrictions exist on telephone and travel outside the state. Networks with colleagues and peers in other states are not encouraged.

A few divisions of the DOE's tend to be more effectual in their activities with local school districts. These divisions included those in vocational education, but Dentler did not mention the guidance and counseling services (Dentler, 1984). In his summary on the variance among DOE's, he listed some of the characteristics as related to local school districts. He referred to SEAs, which are state education agencies, and the LEAs, which are the local education agencies. The SEA is another way to specify the state DOE while the LEA refers to local school district administrative offices.

- (1) SEAs organize themselves to become more or less actively involved in the policies and practices of all LEAs within their boundaries . . .

- (2) SEAs organize themselves to provide something between a very high and a very low amount, as well as quality of technical assistance to LEAs . . .
- (3) SEAs vary greatly in the emphasis they give to the determination and the attempt at regulation of LEA policies and standards of practice . . .
- (4) SEAs vary widely along a continuum that ranges from low to high organizational efficacy. (Dentler, 1984, pp. 151-152)

In conclusion, Dentler suggested that educational improvements were better implemented through state-local relationships, but that DOE's were generally not organized to promote policy changes. Most DOE's did not operate efficiently, due to lack of skills, of money, and of access to the local districts. He recommended strong communication, coordination, and collaboration be established among national, state, and local educational systems to improve existing conditions. However, the collaboration must not involve a change in the local autonomy, but should exist to improve the DOE services to be delivered (Dentler, 1984).

The state DOE's have specialized divisions, sections, or bureaus that facilitate the services to be delivered by the state. The pupil personnel section, also known as student services, is one that specializes in many functions, among which are the guidance and counseling services.

DOE Pupil Personnel Services

Pupil personnel staff perform duties specified for the DOE's, with particular emphasis placed on the personal, academic, and vocational growth of students in the public

schools. The significance of this service as an integral part of the total educational program was indicated in the following policy statement by the Council of Chief State School Officers (1960):

The primary purpose of a program of pupil personnel services is to facilitate the maximum development of each individual through education. These services are essential to the adequate appraisal of individual needs and potentialities and the realization of these potentialities. They help each individual to develop the insight which will lead to self-understanding, educational, occupational, and avocational opportunities. Thus, they contribute to the development of our human resources which are so vital to the strength of our nation. (p. 2)

The development of pupil personnel services can be credited significantly to the leadership roles served by the staff of state DOEs (Warner, 1969). The unification of guidance, psychological attendance, health, and social work services under the pupil personnel division of the DOEs occurred mainly with the passage of the NDEA of 1958. Of these services, the guidance and counseling division is the main concern for this study.

Pupil Personnel: Guidance and Counseling Division

The beginning of the guidance and counseling division within many state DOEs was brought about as a direct result of federal legislation which mandated the establishment of these state supervisory services. The earliest employment of a state-appointed supervisor of guidance services was recorded in 1929 (Warner, 1969).

Six states created state guidance supervisory services for secondary schools between 1931 and 1940. Expansion of these services occurred between 1941 and 1950 when 15 states formed secondary guidance services. The years between 1951 and 1960 reflected even more growth as 22 additional states established secondary guidance services in the DOEs (Warner, 1969).

Elementary school guidance services were authorized under Title V-A with the amended NDEA of 1964. Thirty-two state DOEs were reported to have initiated the formation of state supervision of elementary guidance programs during these two years (Warner, 1969).

Current data on the guidance services were reported in the longitudinal study of Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985). According to their 1983 survey, at least 42 states had staff employed in divisions of school guidance and counseling that were serving elementary, middle, and high school institutions.

State guidance services were established and maintained as a direct result of federal assistance pushing for states to take the initiative (Hill, 1974). The federal assistance came in two main forms: (a) grants-in-aid and (b) advice and professional aid to the offices of guidance services (Warner, 1969).

The responsibilities of the state DOEs include the following instructions on guidance and counseling services:

- (1) Study and report on the status and needs for guidance and counseling programs at the local level.
- (2) Assist local school districts in establishing, extending, evaluating, and improving guidance and counseling programs and procedures, coordinating these with other pupil personnel services, the instructional program, and community resources.
- (3) Recommend certification requirements for counselors and assist institutions of higher education to develop and improve programs of counselor preparation and pre-service education of teachers in their role in the guidance program.
- (4) Provide for in-service education in guidance for school districts in planning in-service education in guidance for school staff members.
- (5) Establish and maintain relationships with agencies and organizations whose programs relate to guidance and counseling.
- (6) Prepare and distribute guidance and counseling resources, publications, and materials; collect and report on good guidance and counseling practices and procedures.
- (7) Evaluate the effectiveness of guidance and counseling programs and assist local school districts in their own evaluations. (Council of Chief State School Officer, 1960, p. 14)

Current guidelines list these same instructions.

A study by Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985) examined the responsibilities of the state DOE's guidance and counseling staffs. The following 11 responsibilities were investigated:

1. Liaison to agencies
2. Demonstration, pilot, or exemplary program development and research
3. Career and life planning
4. Individual and group counseling
5. Evaluation of counseling
6. Federal program development and administration
7. Placement of students
8. Psychological services
9. Research (student needs or guidance program)
10. Testing, measurement, and evaluation
11. Vocational rehabilitation. (p. 272)

The in-service activities of the guidance staffs were separated and specified in a list of eight activities to include career planning, crisis intervention training, ethics and professional responsibility, legal responsibilities, needs assessment training, record keeping training, skill development, and supervision and/or training of paraprofessionals and peer counselors. The authors suggested that the number of responsibilities had increased for the DOE staffs (Wantz, Corvin, & Hollis, 1985).

Heddesheimer (1978) suggested that the federal funds from the NDEA, V-A and V-B, may have harmed as well as helped guidance and counseling services. The funding may have caused damage by providing too much too quickly. As a result, counseling programs expanded before the profession had an opportunity to develop an identity and to define its role in education. Role definitions and identity within the educational system remain as problems for the school counseling profession today (Schmidt, 1984).

The position and role responsibilities of the DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling are not easily defined, described, or identified. Research has not been reported in the professional journals to describe the priorities DOE guidance consultants place on their role responsibilities within the guidance and counseling divisions. The need for a role study has been advocated (e.g., Erpenbach, 1977; Gade & Zaccaria, 1966; Geoffroy & Duncan,

1971; Herr, 1971; Wantz, Corvin, & Hollis, 1985; Warner, 1969).

DOE School Guidance Consultants

Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985) suggested that the roles of the DOE consultants are too fragmented due to areas of responsibility, the number of clientele served, and the amount of time spent in activities, which are generally unrelated to the guidance and counseling functions. The authors suggested that many changes have taken place in the roles served by the state guidance staff.

The position of the DOE consultant is supported and maintained by funding from state and federal grants-in-aid sources. Herr (1979) has suggested that this state-level position appears to be directly affected by changes in the U.S. Office of Education. According to Herr (1979), the federal money determined the direction for the individual states to follow, regardless of the assertions of independence made by state legislators and DOE staff. Herr also suggested that the responsibilities for the DOE consultants depend on the major emphases found among states, the DOEs, and state legislatures. As a result, the roles of state consultants are not clearly defined on a national perspective (Herr, 1979).

Erpenbach (1977) was concerned for state consultants' undefined relationship with counselor educators. He contended that state consultants educators needed to work more

cooperatively so that counselor preparation would be more practical. According to Erpenbach (1977), a gap existed between preparation and the actual work experience. He assumed that state consultants better understand conditions in the schools and that they could help counselor educators develop practical programs.

Erpenbach (1977) suggested to counselor educators that doctoral-level internships be established at the state-department level. This procedure would encourage persons to prepare for careers in supervision and develop understanding of the role and job functions. He also recommended a job exchange program between counselor educators and state consultants in which counselor educators work as state consultants and state consultants work as counselor educators. He speculated the exchange would prove to be more difficult for the counselor educators than the consultants.

Lastly, Erpenbach suggested the establishment of a mutually agreed-upon program review and approval procedures. At the time of this suggestion review procedures were in operation in a few states in the school counselor certification process (Erpenbach, 1977).

Erpenbach maintained that state consultants have not occupied the influential leadership role Hoyt (1966) and Herr (1971) wrote about. State consultants working closely with counselor educators could strengthen the counseling profession (Erpenbach, 1977).

The fact that in many state DOE's, the guidance consultants have other major responsibilities emphasizes the lack of a clear leadership role. In some states DOE consultants are placed under the direction of pupil personnel services and in other states the consultants work in a separate guidance and counseling division. In the study by Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985), two states, Arizona and Alaska, were reported not to have personnel employed to assist with guidance and counseling functions at the state department level.

Most of the DOE school counseling personnel work in roles supported largely by federal funds. Various job titles, for example, suggest that many consultants have jobs dependent on special federal projects. But, the unwillingness of state governments to assume the costs of the position indicated a dim future for the counseling consultants (Heddesheimer, 1978).

However, Public Law 94-482, the Educational Amendments of 1976, financially benefited the position of state consultants. To meet the federal mandates within this legislation, consultants were given the responsibility of providing and assuring coordination of programs which support guidance services to the public schools. To aid in the sorting out of responsibilities and planning for the state level role, Heddesheimer (1978) contended it is desirable to have a current study of the DOE consultants' roles.

DOE Consultant Role Studies

Geoffroy and Duncan (1971) conducted a survey of 280 state directors and supervisors of guidance services in the 50 states. A factor analysis of their questionnaire responses indicated three major categories for the perceived responsibilities of state supervisors of guidance services. These state supervisors viewed the role of advocating the value of guidance services as a top priority. More specifically, this priority involved promoting guidance services in the schools, encouraging advanced education for those seeking a profession in counseling, and developing good public relations among teachers, parents, and school administrators.

The second priority identified was that of consultant services. The state supervisors felt they should maintain contact with agencies and schools in order to initiate and maintain guidance services effectively.

The third category identified in this study was non-involvement. This non-involvement category suggested that state supervisors were doing many things in which they did not wish to be involved. This included, for example, their reluctance to become directly involved in the process of counselor education, routine paperwork and details, the instructional work of seminars, and some administrative procedures such as counselor evaluation.

The analysis conducted by Geoffroy and Duncan (1971) suggested little evidence that any part of the role of the

state supervisors was concerned with evaluation. The authors felt this attitude indicated an absence of control and centralization of guidance services. The population of state supervisors surveyed in the study was assumed by the authors to have come from the ranks of school counselors.

The training of school counselors at that time apparently did not involve professional preparation in supervision/administration. This lack of professional training may have been the reason for the reported reluctance of consultants to evaluate or to enforce standards on others.

Geoffroy and Duncan (1971) pointed out that with the expanding, reorganizing, and developing services of the state DOE's to meet the changing educational program demands, many new state-level positions may be added and present positions may be redefined. The authors stressed the importance of a replication of their study to maintain "an accurate perspective on this important role" (p. 145).

Herr (1971) conducted a study in 1968 to identify the guidance functions that national groups of school counselors, counselor educators, and state supervisors agreed should be the responsibility of the state guidance office staff. A 36-item questionnaire was developed to include administrative, regulatory, and developmental functions to describe the state-level position. Nineteen items showed 75% or better agreement among the 200 respondents of the three groups, six items were not supported as defined by less than 50% agreement across the three groups, and

six items were listed as sources of potential conflict among the three groups. The items on this survey are found in Appendix B and reflect the tables of accumulated results found by Herr (1971).

Again, when comparing the results of the study by Herr (conducted prior to the spring of 1971) and that of Geoffroy and Duncan (conducted prior to the winter of 1971), the primary role of state consultants was viewed to be that of a "promoter" of guidance services. Herr found agreement among the three groups surveyed for the role to include the advocacy of the need for guidance services; a liaison function to state legislatures and agencies and youth-oriented lay and professional organizations outside the state government; and leadership in developing state guidance plans, counselor certification requirements, and coordination of statewide in-service programs. Herr (1971) summarized that the study's findings indicated agreement upon a balanced role for state consultants and that their roles should reflect leadership, advocacy, and support to the counseling profession.

An earlier study by Warner (1969) was conducted in 1967 to determine the administrative organization, functions, and objectives of the pupil personnel service in DOE's.

The guidance functions surveyed were

- (1) Visiting educational institutions
- (2) Conducting in-service education activities for local level pupil personnel specialists
- (3) Relating the state guidance/pupil personnel supervisory staff to the professional guidance associations

- (4) Conducting statewide testing programs within the state. (p. 60)

Among the conclusions reached were that an excessive amount of time was spent on administrative activities rather than on promotional, developmental, and liaison objectives. Most of the state DOEs' major objectives included the improvement and the strengthening of elementary and secondary guidance services. Again, the recommendation was made for further research in pupil personnel services to note change and development in the local, state, and national guidance services (Warner, 1969).

The longitudinal study conducted by Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985) during the decade from 1973 to 1983 focused on trends and implications about the roles and functions of the guidance and counseling staff of state DOEs. The main purposes of that study were to investigate staff numbers, time spent on some general functions of guidance and counseling, and changes occurring over the 10-year period. The authors indicated the changes noted in their study supported the idea that "counseling services can become quickly outdated if not modified to meet changing population needs" (p. 273).

The study of Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985) indicated the need for an in-depth study of the state-level guidance and counseling leadership positions. The changing society, the current funding cutback, the need for leadership in the

guidance and counseling profession, and the future implications for personnel decreases have strongly emphasized the need to continually evaluate, define, and support these state level leaders.

Subjects of Interest for a Role Study

The subjects of interest for this role study of state consultants included personal, professional, and state profile information; perceptions of job functions in the four role areas of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development; and degrees of job satisfaction.

General Profile

Camp (1964) surveyed 210 state guidance employees in 1962, and of 178 returns, found 83% were male. The median age of the employees was 48.9 years. The average salary was \$8,831; 22.86% had a doctorate; and 80% were members of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) (now American Association of Counseling and Development). Of the APGA members, 61.8% were in Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES); and 37.64% were in American School Counselors Association (ASCA).

The report by Heddesheimer (1978) noted the more current demographics of state consultants. In 1976, 233 guidance and counseling professional state staff were reported in a U.S. Office of Education list. There were

167 males and 33 females. The salaries were approximately \$24,000. The professional memberships, taken from the January 1977 conference "New Imperatives in Guidance," showed that 33% were APGA members, and of those, 51% were ACES members. No current information was reported in either Erpenbach's or Heddesheimer's data regarding the 1977 average age or the educational level of the state consultants.

Another subject of interest in the demographic section for the role study included information concerning numbers of school counselors and students served in each state by the DOE consultants. In 1982 there were more than 63,000 school counselors in our public schools (National Data Book and Guide to Sources, 1984). These school counselors served more than 56 million students.

Since the future for state consultants has been questioned (Heddesheimer, 1978), the comparisons made to these figures may indicate significant trends. These trends may also be indicated in the four role areas (leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development) and the specific job functions for each role.

Role Areas and Specific Job Functions of Interest

The four areas of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development investigated in this study were determined from a combination of past studies of consultants' roles and some recent literature on some

specified needs of the counseling profession. In the studies by Geoffroy and Duncan (1971) and Herr (1971) the roles of leadership, consultation, research, and professional development were described as role areas for the state supervisors.

The leadership/management role. The area of "promotion" (Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971) of guidance services is too broad a concept to use to separate effectively the types of job functions. Most job functions of state consultants may be viewed as promotional. The area of leadership/management appeared to be the best label to cover many of these "promotional" functions and services described in the Geoffroy and Duncan study. The necessity for professional leadership and for coordinated management in counseling has been advocated recently by several authors (Aubrey, 1982; Glennen, 1984; Nejedlo, 1983, 1984).

In addition, Dentler (1984) suggested that state-level supervisors have the authority to execute policies of the state boards, enforce state regulations, and even to act as administrative law officers in cases of local disputes. Watts (1981) said that the directors of student services need to provide visible leadership to encourage short and long-range cooperative planning for the system. In Herr's study (1971) 80% agreement was reached among the school counselors, counselor educators, and state supervisors for the support of the state-level guidance and counseling leadership position.

Leadership is not generally determined by the position, but rather by performance and results of the individual in that position. According to Eye (1975), the leadership role assigned to the state department consultants was essentially "assigned power." The existence of the power and its influence upon people and programs, he cautioned, must have periodic evaluation to judge its quality. Several bases were reported necessary for the quality of power evaluation.

One basis for judging the quality of power was to determine the extent to which the role of state consultants maintains a relevance to the purposes for which it was created. The legislatures generated the leadership power with respect to outcome needs of the school population. An evaluation of the role functions was necessary to judge the way the power was administered in relation to the purposes for which it existed (Eye, 1975).

Another basis for evaluation of the leadership power was through the modes of communication. The personalizing of the communication process becomes an important determiner as to whether the quality of the power is being realized. Eye (1975) contended that sensitivity to the interaction was the better system of communication. Personal contact of state consultants to the statewide counselor and supervisor population is necessary as a means of influencing and promoting change.

Eye (1975) maintained that those who have this leadership "assigned" power must try to give it a purposeful

existence. Bacharach and Mitchell (1983) suggested that power is essential for getting things done in an organization. To develop an understanding of the state-level leadership power, according to Eye (1975), the state-level personnel must spend time communicating the purposes for which the role has been created and the reasons for which the assigned power existed.

If the state consultants have the leadership power and authority, and the professionals agree upon this leadership role for consultants, a role investigation may help to clarify the purpose, the importance, the time, and the effort given to this position. No such role investigation had yet been done.

The consultation role. The second area identified for study in this investigation is consultation. The study conducted by Geoffroy and Duncan (1971) recognized the service function as essential to the role of state consultants. The functions listed under the service label were consultation activities. The Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985) study indicated that the consultant service of the state guidance and counseling staff was expanding.

Kurpius (1984) emphasized the need for consultation services in all areas of counseling. He contended that consultation should take place in conjunction with the total system to help all members at all levels to understand better the significance of statewide information and changes. He also suggested that a consultative network be

established for professional identification of those who do consultation. The purpose of the network for the consultants was to promote cooperation in thinking, in planning, and in learning.

The research on the effectiveness of consultation is limited and little agreement across studies exists about what successful consultation is and how to evaluate its outcome (Dustin & Ehly, 1984). A suggested outcome of consultation is to create positive change within a system (Male, 1982). According to Myrick (1977), the direction and evaluation role of the counselor supervisor is accompanied by a trend toward more emphasis on consultation.

If the role of consultation is important, effective for change, but not researched at the state department level, an investigation of the related job functions was needed to clarify how the state consultants deliver this service.

The research role. A third role area for job functions is research. This role emerged from a perusal of many state DOE job descriptions for state consultants. Fitzpatrick (1967) contributed to the selection of the research role for the study. He wrote about the need for and the apparent lack of research at the state department level.

Erpenbach and Perrone (1985) emphasized need for counselors to be given more assistance in measuring outcomes of their work. Credibility is developed through accountability studies which allow others to understand and to support effective counseling programs. Professional program

research for both current and longitudinal data establishes credibility.

According to Sieber (1975) activities conducted in isolated settings by autonomous performers do not contribute to the common goals of educational reform. He contended that the state DOE personnel (among others) are in the position to initiate, supervise, and evaluate balanced statewide research. He used the concept of "balanced" (p. 4) research to include a symmetry among the components of functions (basic research, applied research, systems development, dissemination, local problem solving, technical assistance, evaluation); performers (social scientists, professional educators, practitioners); setting (universities, government labs, schools); decision-makers (federal, state, and local educational agencies, professionals, businessmen, minorities); and supply and demand (research and development resources and the need for research). An evaluation of the research function for the DOE consultants was not found in the professional literature.

The professional development role. The fourth role area classification emerged as functions to aid the professional development of school counselors. The functions listed in this role include the liaison to state legislators and staff, counselor educators, and other DOE personnel or state level officers. The professional development duties also include the consultants' assistance in developing certification and/or licensure standards. Staff development

through in-service workshops or conferences is another part of this role.

The professional development role of state consultants has been noted for its importance by several authors (Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971; Herr, 1971; Minkoff & Terres, 1985). In the study by Schmidt and Barret (1983), the surveyed supervisors of counseling services in North Carolina reported major efforts being made to promote the professional development of counselors. Seventy-nine percent of the 42 responding North Carolina supervisors planned to present in-service workshops during the year for the school counselors.

According to Eye (1975), the consultants' paper communications of new plans, purposes, and/or processes are not enough to promote professional development of personnel. Communication and interaction in the form of personally presenting local school district workshops, seminars, or conferences are the vehicles that develop professionalization. Other developmental interactions include publicizing the good work of counseling personnel. The recognitions and commendations that come from leaders in the DOE do much to stimulate people in the field to increase their professional development.

Are the DOE consultants devoting time to the professional development activities for counselors and supervisors? Do they feel the work they perform in these activities is effective and do they receive feedback from

the counseling personnel to evaluate the in-service, professional work adequately? What do the consultants forecast for the future of this role in professional development? Nothing to answer these questions was available in the literature. Because this role of professional development further specifies the work of state consultants, related job functions were listed in the questionnaire for their evaluation.

Degrees of Job Satisfaction

The multi-faceted complexity of the DOE consultants' work in these four role areas might be a cause for a degree of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has been suggested to be a multi-dimensional concept which describes how a person may feel about various facets of his or her work (Dessler, 1979).

Due to the complexity of the job satisfaction concept, researchers have found it difficult to measure and define (McKee & Murphy, 1984). Traditionally, job satisfaction has been assumed to follow a single underlying continuum of high to low degrees of satisfaction (Young & Davis, 1983). Herzberg (1976) attempted to separate this continuum into two, that of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, but since a valid measure of job dissatisfaction does not exist (Young & Davis, 1983), his theory was not incorporated into this role study. Dessler (1979) suggested that to measure how satisfied an employee may be, it is necessary to measure

satisfaction with important facets of the job (e.g., pay, promotions, recognition, working conditions).

Because of the definition, conceptual, and measurement problems associated with job satisfaction, recent investigations have tended to focus on the determinants of job satisfaction (Bowditch & Buono, 1982). In this role study the emphasis was placed on summing the sources of job satisfaction in accordance with the work of Dessler (1979). Spencer and Steers (1981) and Greenspan (1985) are other researchers who have used the sums of Likert-type scales on instruments that reflect job satisfaction in terms of the facets of personal and professional working conditions.

Spencer and Steers measured job satisfaction using the scale developed by Hackman and Lawler (1971). This scale, which was developed to measure general job satisfaction in terms of employee reactions to job characteristics, had a coefficient alpha of .71 for their sample.

The Greenspan (1985) research used the Brayfield-Roth Index of Job Satisfaction to determine a level of satisfaction among psychologists, social workers, and teachers. The level of satisfaction was then compared to perceived leader behavior, individual dogmatism, age, and sex.

Researchers investigating perceptions of job satisfaction have long suspected casual relationships to job functions (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982). Further, they have suggested that positive job satisfaction has a direct effect on decision-making behavior. Thus, those who are satisfied

in their work have a tendency to be more decisive and productive (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982).

Wheeless, Wheelless, and Howard (1983) have suggested that educational administrators with increased work demands often tend to decrease their productivity, to change jobs, and/or tend to be absent and to complain profusely. The authors wrote that 20% of the population have burnout with characteristics ranging from fatigue and absence to dissatisfaction and depression. Wheelless, Wheelless, and Howard (1983) specified job satisfaction as a significant variable found to contribute to the decrease of burnout problems.

Variables influencing job satisfaction (e.g., need fulfillment, promotion frequency, mentally challenging jobs, obtained pay close to valued pay, verbal recognition, adequate working conditions, increased education, a higher position in the organizational structure) have had limited research to examine the relationship to job satisfaction (Wheelless, Wheelless, & Howard, 1983). Other factors suggested by the authors to be generally recognized as making significant contributions to job satisfaction are employees' age, salary, length of service, frequent and quality of interaction with supervisors, and participatory decision-making. The authors warned that although the literature supports these generalizations as contributing to job satisfaction, specific contributions have not been adequately examined.

This role study was concerned with the DOE consultants' work and related personal and professional attitudes and conditions that might indicate their level of job satisfaction. In addition the study examined the consultants' role perceptions according to different degrees of job satisfaction.

The increasing media attention focused on public education has produced concern for teacher attitudes toward their jobs, but little attention has been paid to the attitudes of educational administrators (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983). As noted previously, school guidance and counseling DOE consultants are the state administrators to the state population of school counselors and supervisors.

Bacharach and Mitchell (1983) reported that research has produced the idea that organization and functional factors are important in determining job satisfaction. They proposed that greater bureaucratization led to greater job dissatisfaction, and that professionals involved in bureaucracies and in such processes are often discouraged and do not complete assigned tasks.

Department of education consultants to school guidance and counseling may perceive their role responsibilities in leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development as challenging and gratifying. As a result, they may have a high level of job satisfaction and possibly be more creative, energetic, motivated, and productive in their positions. They may rate many job functions

as essential and feel very effective in the work they perform.

On the other side, perhaps the DOE consultants have rather low job satisfaction. This low satisfaction is a distinct possibility as indicated in the Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis study (1985). These authors reported that state level guidance and counseling staff responsibilities, number of clientele served, and the related and/or unrelated tasks have increased in the past 10 years. As a result, the consultants may have low job satisfaction, much dissatisfaction, or, perhaps, burnout.

By isolating factors or conditions that produce dissatisfaction in the role of the DOE consultants, a reevaluation of the work processes and functions associated with that role may enhance performance and productivity (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983).

Role Study Evaluation

According to Schmidt (1984) the survival of any professional position depends on the necessary ingredients of consensus about the role with proper training to serve the role, a common understanding of priorities, and the ability to demonstrate effectiveness now and for the future. Role ambiguity has been found to be a major cause of job dissatisfaction in recent research (Brief & Aldag, 1976; Jackson, 1983). The inability to cope and to be effective with complex job demands seems to produce low degrees of job

satisfaction (Jackson, 1983). Such research suggests that an effective strategy for increasing job satisfaction may be to clarify the role and job functions of the position (Jackson, 1983).

Therefore, to evaluate the role responsibilities of the DOE consultants, the four categories of importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends were chosen for analysis in this study. These four category evaluations were compared by using the ratings from DOE consultants who have high, average, and low levels of job satisfaction.

Importance

The category of importance was chosen to develop an understanding of the consultants' perceptions of priorities for their work. The study of Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985) reflected a similar interest in the importance of functions as those functions are influenced by the individual philosophies of the state DOEs. These authors compiled a ranked list of priorities for general areas of responsibilities. The list was compiled in 1980 and again in 1983 to indicate the changes and trends that occurred. According to Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985),

Changes are reciprocally related to the development of society with its changing economy, and these data support the position that counseling services can become quickly outdated if not modified to meet changing population needs.
(p. 272)

The importance of needs assessment for planning counseling services has been recognized (e.g., Burck & Peterson, 1985; Stiltner, 1978). The DOE consultants need to examine the priorities of their work to best evaluate how the importance of certain job functions aligns with guidance program objectives. Partin (1983) suggested that professionals need to review their major goals annually in order to realize and/or set priorities for the use and the effectiveness of their time spent. If DOE consultants recognize their important functions, they may then delegate their time and attention more effectively. An examination of the consultants' perceptions regarding priorities and importance of functions was needed to adequately describe and clarify the roles of DOE school guidance and counseling consultants.

Time Spent

Time spent on a function also describes and clarifies the role of DOE consultants. The amount of attention and involvement with each task is influenced by perceptions of priority (Eye, 1975). In the study conducted by Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985), significant trends and implications for the consultants' role were detected when the percentage of time spent and numbers of responsibilities were compared.

According to Eye (1975) those who are leaders often must spend too much time in the mediation of conflict which is not the most productive activity for the educational

system. He contended also that excessive paperwork demands too much time from state level leaders. Time cannot be saved. It is a perishable commodity--one either uses it or loses it. Those who use it effectively have greater control over their lives and careers (Lakein, 1973).

Effective time management is discovering how to improve the quality of time spent in the pursuit of priorities (Lakein, 1973). The broad responsibilities of the DOE consultants can become voracious time-eating monsters, if time is not managed effectively. Role changes occur with changes in society, and the time spent on job functions needs evaluation as role responsibilities change and/or increase. No role studies of DOE consultants have included an examination of the amount of time spent on each job function and related views of effectiveness for that time.

Effectiveness

The third category of job functions' evaluation is effectiveness, which may reflect DOE consultants' general impressions of the results their work generates. Effectiveness in their roles provides a positive record of accountability for the public to notice. Recorded effectiveness not only enhances the professional image, but it also increases the probability of more effective work (DeVoe & McClam, 1982).

To accurately evaluate the effectiveness of counseling services, Schmidt (1984) has suggested that counseling

accountability studies be conducted under a special consultant for supervision and direction. Lewis (1983) has written that evaluation of effectiveness is important to all counseling professionals for job security, professional improvement, and positive self-esteem. No state consultant role study has included impressions of effectiveness on any aspect of the work at the state department level.

If the DOE consultants view their work in certain areas as highly effective, do they spend more time on these functions and consider them more important? The researcher believed the answers to many questions about the counseling profession could be found through an examination of the DOE consultants' job functions as a leader, manager, consultant, researcher, and professional.

Future Trend

Since the publication of Tofler's Future Shock (1970), the public has been more sensitized to the actuality of living with the rapid changes of the future. According to Tofler, it is necessary to "make it possible for individuals to experience aspects of their future in advance . . . to prepare them to cope . . . with tomorrow" (pp. 392-393).

The opinions of perceived leaders have been valued and relied upon by the public. If the DOE consultants are professional counseling leaders, their forecasts for their future roles may have implications for the future of the counseling profession. The ability to look ahead plays a

key role in adaptation (Tofler, 1970). The role that is focused on the future tends to be organized and to be efficient. The ill-defined lack of perspective on future roles contributes to the development of meaninglessness and lack of job satisfaction for the individual and the role served by the individual (Ruffin, 1984).

The longitudinal study conducted by Wantz, Corvin, and Hollis (1985) produced results that indicated major trends and corresponding implications for the role and functions of state consultants to guidance and counseling. The study by these authors was completed in 1983 and changes have occurred since that year.

Therefore, an examination of the current views of the DOE guidance and counseling personnel regarding the trends for emphasis of their role responsibilities that are forecast for the future is continually needed for modification and improvement of services delivered. What role do these consultants view as important in the future of counseling, and what influence may job satisfaction have on their future forecasts?

Summary

An examination of the historical perspective of the guidance and counseling functions in the nation's public schools has indicated a growing complexity in the profession that serves those functions. The federal government strongly influenced the development of the school counseling

profession. It provided millions of dollars for the initiation and implementation of guidance programs to be maintained under the jurisdiction of the individual states. In order to establish, supervise, and evaluate these guidance programs as well as to regulate and administer the federal funds, professional state leadership became necessary.

The state departments of education, which were in existence to supervise educational programs long before the federal legislation mandated some guidance services, became the logical headquarters for professional leadership to school guidance and counseling. The pupil personnel or student services divisions of the DOEs were created partially in response to the federal and to the state legislation, and, partially in recognition of the need to provide competent informed leadership to the school counselors and local supervisors. More specifically, the position of the DOE school guidance and counseling consultant was created to provide a variety of services to the state school counseling population. These services may be generally defined as the role responsibilities of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development.

Several researchers have written about the complex, broadly defined role for these state level leaders and have attempted to specify some consensus on major responsibilities (Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971; Herr, 1971; Wantz, Corvin, & Hollis, 1985; Warner, 1969). All of these researchers recognized the potential leadership functions to the school

counseling profession served by these DOE consultants. But no study examined the consultants' view of the work they perform in terms of importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends.

Professional leadership to school counselors and district supervisors has always been necessary, and especially so now as recent financial and personnel cutbacks challenge the effectiveness of the counseling professionals. The DOE consultants have the access to and the potential influence on state legislators and on the public who both have the power to maintain or to abolish guidance programs in the public schools. The DOE consultants' central position at the state level facilitates their leadership as well as their consultation, research, and professional development functions to the school counseling professionals.

However, as Erpenbach (1977) pointed out, very little is known about the DOE consultants. They are few in number, possibly very influential, and vested by federal law with many responsibilities including supervision of school counseling.

In addition to this lack of information regarding the DOE consultants and their responsibilities, job satisfaction was believed to play an important role as a determinant for functional priorities and productivity. The effect of the degree of job satisfaction on the DOE consultants' role perceptions was thought to be meaningful in the clarification process in this role study. The subsequent

identification of differing perceptions of role functions by comparing ratings of DOE consultants with high, average, or low levels of job satisfaction was believed to have beneficial effects. One such effect could be a new definition, awareness, or restructuring of the complex role these consultants must serve.

According to Sheridan and Vredenburg (1979) the elimination of stressors that cause job dissatisfaction is likely to increase productivity among employees. Other researchers (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982; Jackson, 1983) have suggested that job function clarification has increased job satisfaction.

Therefore, it was the purpose of this study to identify and clarify the functions of the DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling through an investigation of their role perceptions. After examining their views concerning the importance, time spent, and effectiveness of their work and their views and forecasts for future functions, an evaluation of their roles resulted. In addition, attention was also given to the consultants' level of job satisfaction which was compared to their perceptions of job functions.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This investigation was a descriptive study about the personal and professional demographics, the four major roles and related job functions, and reported job satisfaction of DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling. A questionnaire was developed to provide the data base for the study. Department of education consultants were asked to respond according to whatever information they may have had available, as well as from their own personal perspectives. The questionnaire was organized into three parts: demographics, consultant job functions, and consultant job satisfaction.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the population of the study, the development of the questionnaire, the research procedures, the hypotheses, and the data analyses.

Population

The population for this study consisted of school guidance and counseling consultants in state departments of education in the United States, including the District of

Columbia. DOE consultants were asked to provide information through a questionnaire mailed to them.

A list of state DOE consultants was obtained first from the U.S. Department of Education. This list of names was reviewed for job titles and assignments. Those consultants who had any of their time assigned to school guidance and counseling were asked to participate in the study.

The investigator telephoned each consultant on the revised list. The person was interviewed briefly to determine assignment, percentage of time spent in consultant activities with school counselors, job title, mailing address, and willingness to participate in the study. During the telephone interview, inquiries were made also regarding the names of any other school counseling consultants who may be working for their respective DOEs. Any names of consultants who were missing from the list were added and telephoned for an interview.

A final mailing list contained the names of all 103 DOE school counseling consultants who agreed to participate in the study. They received a research packet containing the cover letter, questionnaire, and returned self-addressed stamped envelope via the U.S. mail.

Development of the Questionnaire

The research method used in this study required the development of a valid questionnaire designed to gather descriptive data from DOE school guidance and counseling

consultants. More specifically, an instrument was needed which would provide information regarding DOE consultant personal and professional data, their roles and job functions, and the levels of their job satisfaction. Therefore, the investigator developed a three-part questionnaire which was mailed to the consultants.

The development of the questionnaire took place over several months after consulting with counselors, university professors, and DOE state consultants. Several revisions were made in an attempt to have an instrument that was appealing, comprehensive, concise, and relatively easy to answer.

The investigator talked by telephone with four DOE consultants (from Florida, Louisiana, Wisconsin, and California) whose primary responsibilities were in school counseling. These consultants had experience in all grade levels of school counseling and had worked in their present positions a minimum of 10 years. The consultants were asked to describe their present role responsibilities for their state positions. In addition, the investigator requested current job descriptions of their present assignments.

The information obtained from the preliminary interviews with the four consultants and an inspection of the job descriptions revealed a lack of uniformity regarding consultant roles and job functions. These interviews reinforced the need for this study and provided a basis for the formulation of the questionnaire.

The Questionnaire

Three important factors were considered in the development of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). First, the content had to reflect the purposes of the study. More specifically, attention was given to personal and professional data, consultant roles and job functions, and finally consultant job satisfaction.

Secondly, special consideration was given to the organization of the questionnaire. The format had to be one that would be thorough, easy to complete, and not too time consuming. It had to be worded in such a way as to produce the desired information for analysis. It also needed eye appeal in order to stimulate the consultant's interest.

Thirdly, the instrument required some validation. That is, it needed to reflect the data accurately from each consultant. Since most of the data that were collected depended upon the judgment and perceptions of the individual consultants, the instrument had to elicit accurate and reliable information.

The first page of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) was designed to collect personal, professional, and state guidance information. Personal information included job title, address, phone number, age, sex, salary, highest degree held and university, and work experience. This information was needed to organize the data to contribute to a national profile of state consultants.

The professional information requested included the memberships that consultants held in professional organizations. Also requested were the number of years experience in school counseling and years in present position.

The number of school counselors in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools was also requested. This information was not readily available in the professional literature or from the professional counseling organizations. Annual reports from the consultants may be made to the states, but this information was not usually distributed to the general public or assembled for a national picture. The last published report on the numbers of school counselors in different grade level assignments was from the 1980 national census report (National Data Book and Guide, 1984).

The data collected from this part of the questionnaire provided an opportunity to present a profile of DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling. In addition, current information was tabulated to present the prevailing status of school counselor to student ratios. It also helped to describe the extent of the supervision the state consultants' had to manage.

A review of the professional literature and the preliminary interviews with DOE consultants indicated that most consultants functioned in four major roles. Recurring themes in job descriptions by consultants added to the selection of these roles: leadership/management;

consultation; research; and professional development (Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971; Herr, 1971; Warner, 1969).

After the four roles were identified, specific job functions for each role were then specified. Both consultants and a review of the professional literature proved helpful in obtaining a list of general job functions. For example, the first role identified was that of a leader/manager. This role was then clarified by delineating some specific job functions which were related to the role. These functions provided more details regarding what a consultant might do in this role.

Approximately 10 job functions were listed for each of the four roles. Although the lists of functions are not inclusive of all possible job functions they provided respondents with an opportunity to report information that was representative of a role.

Thirty professional educators in the state of Florida were asked to review a list of 40 undifferentiated job functions that had been compiled by the investigator. Each person responded by placing a job function on the list in one of the four roles. If a job function had 60% or better agreement among the educators, then the function was deemed valid for that role area. The educators who participated in this pilot study included some retired and some active school administrators, school counselors, teachers, and university professors.

After the job functions were identified for each of the four roles, four evaluation categories were constructed. These categories enabled the respondents to report their personal perceptions of the job functions. The four categories were (a) importance of the function, (b) time spent on the function, (c) effectiveness of the work in the function, and (d) the future trend for the work in the function.

The category of importance had been chosen to develop a rated list of job functions in each role area. More specifically, a Likert-type scale was used to rate the importance of a job function as follows:

- 5--Essential
- 4--Very important
- 3--Important
- 2--Of less importance
- 1--Unimportant.

The second category, time spent, had been included to disclose the amount of consultant attention and involvement with each function. The category ratings were based, again, on a Likert-type scale to obtain the following information:

- 5--A daily task
- 4--Once or twice a week
- 3--Once or twice a month
- 2--Once or twice a year
- 1--Never get to it.

The third category indicated impressions of the respondent regarding effectiveness. A five-point Likert-type was used to elicit the following information:

- 5--Successful results, very positive feedback
- 4--Adequate results, some positive feedback
- 3--Effectiveness uncertain, very little feedback
- 2--Clearly ineffective for positive feedback
- 1--Undesirable results, some negative feedback.

Future trends for job functions was the fourth category. The respondent was to indicate the amount of emphasis to be placed on the functions in the future. A Likert-type scale provided the following information:

- 5--Greatest emphasis in this type of function
- 4--Moderate emphasis
- 3--No changes indicated in this function
- 2--Less emphasis--a moving away from this type of work
- 1--Disappearing fast, will no longer be involved with this type of work.

To validate the Likert-type scales used for each category, 10 professional educators, which included doctoral candidates, psychologists, and University of Florida professors, were asked to review the scales. Some modifications were made to regulate the symmetry of the scales, sequentially decreasing from five to one.

The last part of the questionnaire was developed to collect information from the consultants regarding their views of their work and the status of counseling in their respective states. Embedded within the general opinions evaluated was the consultants' views of job satisfaction. These state level officials work with many people in a variety of situations. The reported increases in job responsibilities (Wantz, Corvin, & Hollis, 1985) coupled with the pressures of meeting and working with the public are factors that cause stress and possible dissatisfaction with their jobs.

To detect the DOE consultants' views about their job satisfaction, a list of statements was developed. The statements included information about responsibilities, compensations, DOE staff and facilities, professional counseling organizations, and personal attitudes. Degree of agreement with these statements was obtained by using a five-point Likert-type scale. The scale ranged from "strongly agree" to one indicating "strongly disagree."

These statements were written specifically to gain insight to the consultants' level of job satisfaction. More specifically, the 30 items in Part Three, were mainly concerned with the DOE positions. These 30 items, when summed were used as a measure for each consultant's degree of job satisfaction. Professionals, including psychologists, school counselors, administrators and counselor

educators were asked to review the list and to check each statement's relationship to job satisfaction.

Pilot Study

After modifications and revisions were completed, the questionnaire was reviewed by Florida and South Carolina DOE consultants in student services. A sample questionnaire was sent to each of five consultants to examine the clarity of directions, content requested, and ease of answering. Final revisions were made. At this point the questionnaire was printed. The remaining research procedures were implemented.

Instructions and Printing

The questionnaire was organized into three parts and each part was introduced by a short statement concerning its content and purpose. Short introductions such as these were made to help the respondent make some sense out of the questionnaire. The questionnaire would then seem less chaotic and the instructions would help to put the respondent in the proper frame of mind to answer.

The questionnaire was printed and stapled into a booklet. Respondents marked directly on the questionnaire, which was then returned to the investigator.

Hypotheses

There were five dependent variables in this study: job-function importance, time spent on each job function, effectiveness of the work completed on each job function, the future trend for the job function, and the level of consultant job satisfaction. The job functions were classified into four major roles which were the independent variables. The four major roles were leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development.

The first two research questions in this study were addressed through the use of descriptive statistics, which provided general profiles of DOE consultants and their roles: What is the national profile of the DOE consultant? How do DOE consultants perceive their role responsibilities as delineated by job functions in terms of importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends?

The third research question focused on the consultants' job satisfaction and their roles: Does DOE consultants' degree of job satisfaction affect their perceptions of job functions in four major roles? To answer this question, the following 16 null hypotheses were tested ($p. < .05$).

Leadership/Management

1. There will be no significant difference among the perceptions of state consultants' leadership/management job functions when rated by importance as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

2. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' leadership/management job functions when rated by time spent as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.
3. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' leadership-management job functions when rated by effectiveness as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.
4. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' leadership/management job function when rated by future trends as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

Consultation

5. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' consultation job function when rated by importance as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.
6. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' consultation job function when rated by time spent as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.
7. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' consultation job function when rated by effectiveness as a function of low, medium or high levels of job satisfaction.

8. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' consultation job function when rated by future trends as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

Research

9. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' research job functions when rated by importance as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.
10. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' research job functions when rated by time spent as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.
11. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' research job functions when rated by effectiveness as a function of low, medium, high levels of job satisfaction.
12. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' research job functions when rated by future trends as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

Professional Development

13. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' professional development job functions when rated by importance as a

function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

14. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' professional development job functions when rated by time spent as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.
15. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' professional development job functions when rated by effectiveness as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.
16. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' professional development job functions when rated by future trends as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

Data Analyses

The data generated by this study were analyzed by various statistical procedures. Frequency distributions, measures of central tendency, and percentages were used to describe the respondents and their views of the job functions in the four major roles. Analyses of variance were used to test the null hypotheses.

Research Procedures

The research procedures in this investigation were organized into six major phases in order to collect, analyze, and describe the data. These procedures are described in the following sections.

Phase One: The List

A current national list of all DOE school guidance and counseling consultants was not available at the beginning of this study. The U.S. Department of Education supplied the 1983 list of DOE consultants which the investigator and the Florida DOE Consultant reviewed together. The preliminary list of consultants to call was completed.

The final list of participants who receive the questionnaire was yet to be identified. Arrangements with the consultants, which were determined by telephone interviews, were pending upon the approval of the proposal.

Phase Two: The Questionnaire

The development of the questionnaire was initiated. A copy may be seen in Appendix A. The nominal, ordinal, and interval measures were used in the different analytical techniques. The research questions proposed for this investigation necessitated the different types of measurements so that the variables could be properly analyzed.

Because the investigator was interested in the relationships among variables, the questionnaire was designed in

an effort to maximize the variance among the respondents. Part Two and Part Three of the questionnaire were designed to elicit responses within a five-point range of the Likert-type scale.

Phase Three: The Mail-Out

After the questionnaire was printed, packets for the DOE consultants were assembled and mailed to them. The packet consisted of a cover letter, the questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped return envelope.

The cover letter was written with consideration to the guidelines from McMillan and Schumacher (1984). A copy of the letter can be seen in Appendix A.

When the packets were assembled, they were mailed to the DOE consultants on the finalized list. After a specified period of time, follow-up procedures were conducted.

Phase Four: The Follow-Up

After a period of approximately four weeks, the completed questionnaires were returned from a majority of the DOE consultants. The original mailing list of names was compared to a list of those who had not responded. A second list was compiled of those who had not responded. A follow-up telephone call was made to those consultants who had not responded. After another week or two, a postcard was mailed to those who had not yet responded.

The data collection was taking place as an ongoing process as the questionnaires were returned. Phase Five began as soon as the questionnaires were returned.

Phase Five: The Data Collection

As the completed questionnaires were returned to the investigator, each was perused for completeness. A tabulation was recorded of the responses from each questionnaire as it was returned. Responses were then transferred into a machine-readable form and were analyzed through the use of a computer.

A response rate of 50% had been suggested to be adequate, 60% good, and 70% very good (Babbie, 1973). The investigator expected a high return. In fact 88% of the state DOEs were represented in the study by 70% of the respondents.

After all responses had been recorded for the computer to read, the data analyses began. The data analyses were conducted using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) program on the computer.

Phase Six: Data Analyses

The computational analyses of the data were conducted by using methods in descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics were computed as frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency. The

inferential statistic procedures to be used were analyses of variance.

The data analyses provided information presented in Chapter IV of this study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

One hundred and three questionnaires were sent to state department of education consultants to school guidance and counseling. The questionnaires were sent to 50 states and the District of Columbia. Of these, 72 questionnaires from 44 states were returned. The 44 states represented in this study are

Arkansas	Maine	Oklahoma
Arizona	Maryland	Oregon
California	Massachusetts	Pennsylvania
Colorado	Minnesota	Rhode Island
Connecticut	Mississippi	South Carolina
Delaware	Missouri	South Dakota
Florida	Montana	Tennessee
Georgia	Nebraska	Texas
Hawaii	Nevada	Vermont
Idaho	New Jersey	Virginia
Illinois	New Mexico	Washington
Iowa	New York	West Virginia
Kansas	North Carolina	Wisconsin
Kentucky	North Dakota	Wyoming
Louisiana	Ohio	

Consultants from six states did not respond. Those states are

Alabama
Alaska
Indiana
Michigan
New Hampshire
Utah

In addition, the consultants from the District of Columbia did not return a questionnaire.

It is worth noting that two of the 44 states at the time of this study did not have a person who was assigned full-time in a DOE consultant position to school guidance and counseling (i.e., Nevada and South Dakota). Consequently, Nevada did not provide any data for this study. The South Dakota respondent noted on his questionnaire that no one was in the position of state guidance consultant at the present time. His answers were based on his previous experience in the position, which was one year preceding this study. He was the consultant to guidance services but at the time of the data collection he was the manager of instructional services. His knowledge and perceptions were deemed relevant for the purposes of this study.

In addition, DOE consultants from Illinois, Tennessee, and Vermont reported that they spend less than 5% of their time directly with school guidance and counseling responsibilities. However, since they were assigned school guidance and counseling duties, their responses and other data were included in the analyses of data for this study.

Therefore, the data for this study were based on 71 completed questionnaires received from the DOE consultants in 43 states. The analyses of the data are reported in this chapter.

The chapter is divided into two parts. In the first part, the information received from the questionnaires is

reported in terms of descriptive statistics and addresses the first two research questions. In the second part, related to the third research question, comparisons of data were made using analysis of variance to test 16 null hypotheses. Post-hoc analyses were also computed using the Tukey studentized range (Honestly Significant Difference) test when appropriate. This part is further divided into the four major role of job functions (leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development) and job satisfaction estimates.

Descriptive Data

The survey results reported in the following sections provide a general profile of the DOE consultants and their job functions.

General Profile

The DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling were asked to provide personal information reflecting their age, sex, salary, position title, highest degree held in education, area of specialization, years of counseling experience in their present DOE positions, and their national professional counseling organization memberships. In addition, the consultants were asked for current information about the numbers of school counselors who serve the student populations in elementary, middle/junior, and high school settings. This information provided a view of the

school population for whom the DOE consultants were assigned the four roles.

The average age of the DOE consultant was 46 years with most of the consultants (66%) in the age range from 35 to 54 years. Of the 71 respondents, 47 were male and 24 were female which makes a ratio of approximately 2:1. Some of the DOE consultants were apparently reluctant to indicate their ages. Only 62 responded to the item (see Tables 1, 2, and 3).

The average number of years counseling experience for the 71 reporting consultants was 10.3 years. One consultant had no previous counseling experience and one had more than 29 years in counseling. The average number of years experience in their present DOE positions was 8.8, with eight consultants having less than one year's experience. Two other consultants had been in the present position for more than 25 years.

Some DOE consultants were also reluctant to report their salaries. Of the 60 who reported their salaries, the average was \$34,375, with the lowest in the nation being \$21,000 and the highest being \$51,000 (see Table 1).

The professional counseling organization memberships (see Table 2) are based on 70 replies. One consultant wrote that the information was too personal and declined to report that information on the questionnaire. However, the professional associations with the most memberships were American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD); American

Table 1. DOE Consultant Age, Salary, and Years of Experience.

	Age n=62	Salary n=60	Years of Counseling Experience n=71	Years of DOE Position Experience n=71
\bar{X}	46.0	\$34,375	10.3	8.8
Minimum	30.0	\$21,000	0.0	1.0
Maximum	62.0	\$51,000	29.0	25.0

Table 2. DOE Consultant Sex and National Professional Memberships.

	Total	AACD	ASCA	ACES
Male	47	28	15	15
Female	24	16	13	6
Total	71	44	28	21

Table 3. Highest Educational Degree Held by DOE Consultants.

	BA	MEd	MS	MA	EdS	EdD	PhD
Freq.	1	19	8	18	4	11	10
Percent	1.4	26.7	11.3	25.3	5.6	15.5	14.1

School Counselors Association (ASCA); and Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). Eighty-five percent of the consultants reported memberships in their state associations for counseling and development.

The information received from the state consultants regarding each state's number of school counselors and the student enrollment in elementary, middle/junior, and high school settings cannot be easily summarized. Each state has its own method of classifying elementary (e.g., K-4, K-5, K-6), middle (e.g., 5-6, 5-7, 5-8, 6-8), junior (e.g., 7-8, 7-9), and high school settings (e.g., 9-12, 10-12). Twenty-two state consultants did not have the information available to them to break down the numbers in each separate setting. The reported numbers of school counselors in each setting, the total student enrollments, and the ratios of school counselors to the total student enrollments are found in Appendix C.

Twenty-six of the state consultants reported ratios of at least one school counselor to 500 students. Two of these states have one school counselor to 250 students (Maryland and Vermont). The remaining 11 states, where the consultants were able to supply the data, had a ratio of one school counselor to 1,000 students.

The list of job titles for each state consultant also provided some interesting data (see Table 4). The titles listed were determined from the returned questionnaires. These titles differ in some cases from the ones given in the

Table 4. State Titles for DOE Consultants to School Guidance and Counseling.

State	Title
Arkansas	Guidance Supervisor, Elementary Specialist State GED Administrator/Guidance Supervisor Supervisor, Career Orientation Guidance Specialist
Arizona	Education Program Specialist
California	Consultant in Pupil Personnel Services
Colorado	Program Manager - Special Programs
Connecticut	State Consultant: Guidance and Counseling Services
Delaware	State Supervisor: Guidance and Pupil Personnel Services
Florida	Vocational and Adult Guidance Consultant Guidance Consultant K - 12
Georgia	Coordinator; Guidance, Counseling and Career Development Consultant: Guidance, Counseling and Career Development
Hawaii	Educational Specialist
Idaho	Coordinator, Guidance/Assessments and Evaluation
Illinois	Educational Administrator Coordinator of Special Education
Iowa	Guidance Consultant Chief, Guidance Services Section
Kansas	Education Program Specialist
Kentucky	Program Consultant Elementary Guidance Consultant

Continued

Table 4. Continued.

State	Title
Louisiana	Supervisor of Guidance Section Chief of Guidance, Counseling and Testing
Maine	State Guidance Supervisor
Maryland	Specialist in Guidance
Massachusetts	Consultant
Minnesota	Specialist, Guidance, Counseling and Careers K - 12, Public and Non-Public
Mississippi	MIS Director
Missouri	Assistant Director Guidance/Placement
Montana	Guidance Specialist
Nebraska	Coordinator: Career Education Rural Education Vocational Special Needs Director, Student Personnel Services
New Jersey	Specialist, Career/Vocational Guidance and Counseling
New York	Bureau of Public Services, Guidance Consultant
North Carolina	Secondary Guidance Consultant Coordinator, School Counseling Section Elementary School Counseling Consultant Guidance Consultant, Middle School Level
North Dakota	Supervisor Vocational Guidance
Ohio	Director, Guidance and Testing Educational Consultant

Continued

Table 4. Continued.

State	Title
Oklahoma	Career Education Coordinator Coordinator, Guidance and Counseling Counseling Consultant Field Coordinator - Oklahoma Vital Information for Education Guidance Coordinator
Oregon	Counseling and Guidance Specialist Director of Student Services
Pennsylvania	Chief, Division of Student Services
Rhode Island	State Career Education Coordinator
South Carolina	Coordinator School Services Unit
South Dakota	Manager, Instructional Services Guidance Consultant
Tennessee	Consultant: Psychological, Guidance, and Health Services
Texas	Occupational Specialist II Education Guidance Specialist I Program Director
Vermont	Consultant Guidance and Health Services
Virginia	Supervisor for Secondary School Guidance
Washington	Director of Support Services
West Virginia	Unit Coordinator, Student Support Services
Wisconsin	Chief, Pupil Services Team Section
Wyoming	Pupil Services Consultant

phone call discussions made for the purpose to contact the correct person in charge of the guidance program supervision. The names, titles and addresses of all DOE consultants contacted either by phone or mail are listed in Appendix D.

Most consultants reported their area of specialization in schooling as guidance and counseling (see Table 5). However, many consultants also listed additional areas from science to industrial arts. It appears that the consultants have a variety of expertise beyond the guidance and counseling area.

Leadership/Management Job Functions

The DOE consultants rated the job functions in each of the four primary consultant roles (leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development) using a Likert-type scale. Each job function was further rated according to the four categories of importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends. A rating of 1 was the lowest estimation and a rating of 5, the highest (see Appendix A).

The different reported numbers for the separate job functions in each role resulted from incomplete returned questionnaires. Those functions not evaluated by consultants might be considered unassigned responsibilities.

Also there may have been some confusion on item #1 in each role. The first item of each role was a general

Table 5. DOE Consultants' Areas of Specialization by Frequencies.

Area	Frequency
Guidance and Counseling	42
Elementary Guidance	3
Career Guidance	4
Job Placement	1
Educational Psychology	6
Adult Occupations Education	1
Vocational Guidance	1
Supervision	1
Education Administration	3
Literature and History	1
Curriculum Instruction	1
Pupil Personnel Services	1
Elementary Education	1
Secondary Education	1
Industrial Arts Education	1
Science Education	1
Human Development	1
Social Work	1
Business and Vocational Education	1

evaluation of that role. Perhaps some consultants thought the items were part of the directions for each role since only 39 to 41 respondents answered these items.

The leadership/management role has been defined as decision-maker, organizer, speaker, and coordinator involving the supervision of statewide guidance programs. Each job function was evaluated in the four categories of importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends.

Importance. The first categorical variable to be evaluated in the leadership/management role job functions was importance (see Table 6). Five of the eleven functions were considered to be very important to essential (ratings of 4 or 5) by more than 60% of the respondents. The five items were #2--develop and revise a statewide guidance plan, #4--evaluate the school guidance program, #5--coordinate statewide seminars for staff development, #8--gain state legislative action for guidance, and #10--maintain statewide communication network for school counselors.

The unimportant functions (ratings of 1 and 2) indicated by more than 60% of the respondents were #6--assist in local school district budget development and #12--coordinate a statewide testing program. Another function, #9--coordinate career education grants--was considered by more than 40% of the respondents as unimportant.

Time spent. The leadership/management role was also evaluated by time spent (see Table 7). Although item

Table 6. Leadership/Management Job Functions by Importance Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in leadership/management (n=41)	2.4	0.0	12.2	34.1	51.3
#2 Develop state guidance plan (n=70)	2.9	10.0	10.0	24.3	52.8
#3 Plan special guidance programs (n=69)	2.9	11.6	30.4	24.6	30.5
#4 Evaluate school guidance programs (n=71)	1.4	9.9	25.3	26.8	36.6
#5 Conduct statewide seminars (n=71)	2.8	1.4	19.7	29.6	46.5
#6 School district budget planning (n=66)	42.4	43.9	7.6	4.5	1.6
#7 DOE budget (n=67)	19.4	20.9	25.4	22.3	12.0
#8 Promote guidance in legislature (n=69)	4.3	7.2	18.8	34.8	34.8
#9 Coordinate career education grants (n=55)	20.0	20.0	30.9	12.7	16.4
#10 Maintain statewide communication network (n=69)	2.9	2.9	20.3	31.9	42.0
#11 Plan guidance services/ state bureaus and agencies (n=68)	2.9	16.2	27.9	29.4	23.6

Continued

Table 6. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#12 Coordinate state testing program (n=54)	46.3	22.2	14.8	9.3	7.4

Note. Likert scale in importance: 1 = unimportant;
2 = less importance; 3 = important; 4 = very
important; 5 = essential.

Table 7. Leadership/Management Job Functions by Time Spent Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in leadership/management (n=40)	5.0	12.5	7.4	32.5	42.5
#2 Develop state guidance plan (n=68)	5.9	38.2	25.0	22.1	8.8
#3 Plan special guidance programs (n=68)	8.8	23.5	41.2	20.5	6.0
#4 Evaluate school guidance programs (n=70)	8.6	31.4	35.7	18.6	5.7
#5 Conduct statewide seminars (n=71)	7.0	29.6	36.6	18.3	7.0
#6 School district budget planning (n=65)	46.2	43.1	6.2	1.5	1.5
#7 DOE budget plan (n=65)	30.8	58.5	7.7	0.0	0.0
#8 Promote guidance in legislature (n=66)	16.7	47.0	22.7	15.2	0.0
#9 Coordinate career education (n=53)	47.2	18.9	17.0	9.4	7.5
#10 Maintain state communication network/counselors (n=67)	7.5	15.0	44.8	25.4	7.5

Continued

Table 7. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#11 Plan guidance services/state bureaus and agencies (n=67)	11.9	23.9	40.3	20.9	3.0
#12 Coordinate state testing program (n=48)	70.8	22.9	4.2	0.0	2.1

Note. Likert scale in time spent: 1 = never get to it;
 2 = once or twice a year; 3 = once or twice a month;
 4 = once or twice a week; 5 = a daily task.

#1--the general evaluation of leadership/management--was rated to be a weekly or daily task (ratings of 4 or 5) by 75% of the respondents, none of the other functions was rated as high (4 or 5) by more than 60% of the respondents. The most time spent was found in item #10--to maintain a statewide communication network for school counselors--which had only 32.9% of the highest ratings (4 or 5).

There were four functions which were considered to need very little, if any, time (ratings 1 and 2) by more than 60% of the respondents. These four functions were #6--assist in local school district budget planning, #7--assist in the development of the departmental budget of the DOE, #9--coordinate career education grants, and #12--coordinate a state testing program.

Effectiveness. The third variable to be evaluated in the leadership/management role was effectiveness (see Table 8). The functions thought to be effective (4 and 5 ratings) by more than 60% of the respondents were #2--develop and revise a statewide guidance plan, #3--plan and organize special guidance programs such as drop-out prevention or substance abuse, #4--evaluate school guidance programs, #5--coordinate statewide seminars for staff development, and #10--maintain a statewide communication network for school counselors.

The functions that were thought to be ineffective or where effectiveness was uncertain (ratings of 1, 2, or 3)

Table 8. Leadership/Management Job Functions by Effectiveness Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in leadership/management (n=41)	2.4	2.4	12.2	43.9	39.0
#2 Develop state guidance plan (n=69)	1.4	1.4	24.6	52.2	20.3
#3 Plan special guidance programs (n=66)	0.0	7.6	30.3	47.0	15.2
#4 Evaluate school guidance programs (n=69)	1.4	4.3	17.4	59.4	17.4
#5 Conduct statewide seminars (n=70)	1.4	2.9	11.4	34.3	50.0
#6 School district budget planning (n=55)	14.5	18.2	41.8	23.6	1.8
#7 DOE budget plan (n=57)	10.5	12.3	45.6	24.6	7.0
#8 Promote guidance in legislature (n=66)	4.5	15.2	39.4	34.8	6.1
#9 Coordinate career education (n=46)	8.7	13.0	23.9	34.8	19.6
#10 Maintain state communication network/counselors (n=69)	2.9	1.4	21.7	52.2	21.7

Continued

Table 8. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#11 Plan guidance services/state bureaus and agencies (n=66)	0.0	4.5	39.4	45.4	10.6
#12 Coordinate state testing program (n=36)	13.9	16.7	52.8	11.1	5.6

Note. Likert scale for effectiveness: 1 = undesirable results; 2 = clearly ineffective; 3 = uncertain; 4 = adequate success; 5 = successful results.

by more than 60% of the respondents were #6--assist the local school district budget planning, #7--help develop the DOE departmental budget, #8--work to gain state legislative action to aid guidance programs, and #12--coordinate a statewide testing program.

Future trends. The fourth variable to be evaluated in this role was future trends (see Table 9). The functions considered by more than 60% of the consultants to have the greatest emphasis in their future roles (ratings of 4 or 5) were #2--develop and revise a statewide guidance plan, #3--plan and organize school guidance programs, #4--evaluate school guidance programs, #5--coordinate statewide seminars for staff development, and #10--maintain a statewide communication for school counselors. The other functions were predicted to have no changes in their future roles.

Functions #9 and #12 were indicated by some of the respondents not to be part of their responsibilities. These consultants who do not coordinate career education grants (#9) were from the following states:

Connecticut	Missouri
Florida	Montana
Georgia	North Carolina
Hawaii	Ohio
Idaho	Oregon
Kentucky	Pennsylvania
Louisiana	Texas
Maine	Vermont

At least 17 consultants do not coordinate a statewide testing program (#12). These consultants were from the following states:

Table 9. Leadership/Management Job Functions by Future Trends Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in leadership/management (n=41)	2.4	7.3	26.8	22.0	41.5
#2 Develop state guidance plan (n=69)	2.9	1.4	23.2	30.4	42.0
#3 Plan special guidance programs (n=68)	3.0	5.9	26.5	39.7	25.0
#4 Evaluate school guidance programs (n=69)	1.4	2.9	29.0	36.2	31.9
#5 Conduct statewide seminars (n=71)	2.9	4.3	21.4	32.9	38.6
#6 School district budget planning (n=62)	22.6	25.8	45.2	3.2	3.2
#7 DOE budget plan (n=62)	12.9	16.1	45.2	21.0	4.8
#8 Promote guidance in legislature (n=68)	5.9	10.3	33.8	30.9	19.1
#9 Coordinate career education (n=52)	21.2	17.3	26.9	25.0	9.6
#10 Maintain state communication network/counselors (n=70)	1.4	2.9	26.1	47.8	21.7

Continued

Table 9. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#11 Plan guidance services/state bureaus and agencies (n=67)	3.0	9.0	40.3	32.8	14.9
#12 Coordinate state testing program (n=45)	28.9	13.3	42.2	5.2	8.9

Note. Likert scale for future trends: 1 = disappearing fast; 2 = moving away from this type of work; 3 = no changes; 4 = moderate emphasis; 5 = greatest emphasis.

California
Connecticut
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Kentucky
Louisiana

Massachusetts
Minnesota
Montana
New Jersey
New York
North Carolina
Pennsylvania

Consultation Job Functions

The consultation role has been defined as the problem-solver, decision-maker, counselor, clarifier, and/or facilitator. The consultants' perceptions of the consultation role job functions are reported in Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11. Each job function evaluation has been presented in terms of percentages for each Likert-scale rating in each categorical variable.

Importance. The first variable to be evaluated in consultation was importance (see Table 10). Four functions received a rating of important to essential (4 or 5) by more than 60% of the respondents. These functions were #3--consult with other DOE consultants in the same state, #7--consult with local school district supervisors, #8--consult with individual school counselors, and #10--consult with university counselor educators.

The functions considered to be unimportant or of less importance by 49% of the consultants were #5--consult with federal legislators and #6--consult with the members of the U.S. Office of Education. Two other functions, #4--consult with state legislators and #9--consult with local business

Table 10. Consultation Job Functions by Importance.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
Consult with:					
#1 General role in consultation (n=39)	5.1	0.0	23.0	30.8	41.0
#2 Consultants in other states (n=68)	1.5	17.6	39.7	23.5	17.6
#3 Consultants in the same state (n=68)	1.5	2.9	22.1	41.2	32.4
#4 State legislators (n=64)	6.3	18.8	28.1	28.1	46.9
#5 Federal legislators (n=65)	20.0	29.2	29.2	15.4	6.2
#6 Members of US Office of Education (n=68)	19.1	26.3	25.0	14.7	14.7
#7 District supervisors to guidance (n=69)	1.4	2.9	10.1	30.4	55.1
#8 Individual school counselors (n=71)	0.0	1.4	10.0	34.3	54.3
#9 Local business groups (n=69)	10.1	23.2	36.2	20.3	10.1
#10 University counselor educators (n=70)	0.0	2.9	24.3	41.4	31.4

Note. Likert-scale for importance: 1 = unimportant; 2 = less importance; 3 = important; 4 = very important; 5 = essential.

Table 11. Consultation Job Functions by Time Spent Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
Consult with:					
#1 General role in consultation (n=39)	5.1	12.8	17.9	28.2	36.0
#2 Consultants in other states (n=68)	14.7	54.4	26.4	2.9	1.6
#3 Consultants in the same state (n=68)	1.6	13.2	25.0	30.9	29.3
#4 State legislators (n=63)	23.8	44.4	28.6	3.2	0.0
#5 Federal legislators (n=63)	52.4	41.3	4.7	1.6	0.0
#6 Members of US Office of Education (n=66)	37.9	43.9	13.6	4.7	0.0
#7 District supervisors to guidance (n=69)	1.4	10.1	39.1	36.2	13.2
#8 Individual school counselors (n=71)	1.4	2.9	21.4	37.1	37.1
#9 Local business groups (n=68)	22.1	44.1	26.5	5.9	1.4
#10 University counselor educators (n=69)	2.9	24.6	49.3	21.7	1.5

Note. Likert-scale in time spent: 1 = never get to it; 2 = once or twice a year; 3 = once or twice a month; 4 = once or twice a week; 5 = a daily task.

groups, were also considered unimportant by more than 25% of the respondents.

Generally, most of the consultation functions had high ratings, which indicated that the consultants consider the functions in this role to be important or essential.

Apparently most respondents believed that these responsibilities were assigned to them as part of their consultant role. However, eight states did not allow consultation with state and federal legislators (items #4 and #5): Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, and Oklahoma.

Time spent. The second variable to be evaluated in the consultation role was time spent (see Table 11). Two functions clearly stand out as daily or weekly tasks (ratings of 5 or 4) by more than 60% of the respondents. These functions were #3--consult with other DOE consultants in the same state and #8--consult with individual school counselors.

Five functions were rated by better than 60% of the consultants as requiring attention and time only once or twice a year (rating of 2), or no attention at all because they never get to the function (rating of 1). Those functions that required so little time were #2--consult with consultants in other DOEs, #4--consult with state legislators, #5--consult with federal legislators, #6--consult with members of the U.S. Department of Education, and

#9--consult with local businesses and special interest groups.

Generally, the weekly to monthly tasks (ratings of 4 and 3) included #7--consultation with local district supervisors and #10--consult with counselor educators at state colleges and universities. More than 60% of the respondents indicated these were monthly to weekly tasks.

Effectiveness. The third variable to be evaluated in this role was effectiveness (see Table 12). The most effective, successful functions (ratings of 5 and 4) in consultation reported were #3--consult with other consultants in the same state, #7--consult with local guidance supervisors, #8--consult with individual school counselors, and #10--consult with university counselor educators.

None of the functions of the consultation role were considered by the majority of the consultants to be ineffective and unsuccessful (ratings 1 and 2). But, those functions that were not considered highly effective were rated as uncertain for effectiveness (rating of 3).

Future trends. The fourth variable to be evaluated in the consultation role was future trends (see Table 13). Four the the nine specific functions were considered to have the greatest emphasis in the consultation role for the future. These functions had a combined percentage of ratings (4 and 5) of more than 60%. These functions were #3--consult with other DOE consultants in the same state,

Table 12. Consultation Job Functions by Effectiveness Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
Consult with:					
#1 General role in consultation (n=39)	5.1	2.6	7.7	41.0	43.6
#2 Consultants in other states (n=65)	3.1	6.2	46.2	36.9	7.7
#3 Consultants in the same state (n=67)	1.5	1.5	17.9	58.2	20.9
#4 State legislators (n=58)	6.9	15.5	34.5	39.7	3.4
#5 Federal legislators (n=54)	14.8	29.6	40.7	11.1	3.8
#6 Members of US Office of Education (n=59)	13.6	23.7	39.0	16.9	6.8
#7 District supervisors to guidance (n=67)	0.0	1.5	12.0	53.7	32.8
#8 Individual school counselors (n=68)	0.0	0.0	8.8	32.4	58.8
#9 Local business groups (n=62)	4.8	8.1	45.2	27.4	14.5
#10 University counselor educators (n=67)	0.0	6.0	13.4	61.2	19.4

Note. Likert-scale in effectiveness: 1 = undesirable results; 2 = ineffective; 3 = uncertain; 4 = adequate success; 5 = successful results.

Table 13. Consultation Job Functions by Future Trends Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
Consult with:					
#1 General role in consultation (n=39)	5.1	5.1	23.1	30.8	35.9
#2 Consultants in other states (n=67)	1.5	9.0	49.3	34.3	6.0
#3 Consultants in the same state (n=67)	1.5	0.0	35.8	46.3	16.4
#4 State legislators (n=62)	11.3	3.2	46.8	21.0	17.7
#5 Federal legislators (n=60)	18.3	10.0	51.7	16.7	3.3
#6 Members of US Office of Education (n=63)	12.7	15.9	46.0	14.3	11.1
#7 District supervisors to guidance (n=68)	0.0	3.0	22.1	44.1	30.9
#8 Individual school counselors (n=69)	0.0	2.9	16.9	39.1	42.0
#9 Local business groups (n=66)	7.6	9.1	56.1	18.2	9.1
#10 University counselor educators (n=70)	0.0	2.9	33.3	46.4	17.4

Note. Likert-scale in future trends: 1 = disappearing fast; 2 = moving away from this type of work; 3 = no changes; 4 = moderate emphasis; 5 = greatest emphasis.

#7--consult with local school district guidance supervisor, #8--consult with individual school counselors, and #10--consult with university counselor educators.

None of the functions were strongly rated to be disappearing or have less emphasis (1 and 2). Most of the remaining functions were considered by the consultants to remain unchanged in the future. Generally, these functions were rated as no change by better than 40% of the respondents.

Research Job Functions

The research role has been defined as writer, data collector, reporter, investigator, data disseminator, and evaluator. The consultants' perception of the research role job functions are reported in Tables 14, 15, 16, and 17. Each job function evaluation has been presented in terms of percentages of each Likert-scale rating in each categorical variable.

Importance. The first variable to be evaluated in the research role was importance (see Table 14). Of the 11 specific functions listed under this role, only one function, #5--write accountability standards for school counselors, had more than 60% of the respondent indicating the item to be very important to essential (ratings of 4 or 5).

Two functions had a combined percentage of more than 60% of the ratings as unimportant (ratings of 1 or 2).

Table 14. Research Job Functions by Importance.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 Evaluate general research role (n=39)	5.1	20.5	41.0	28.2	5.1
#2 Conduct statewide school audits (n=58)	22.4	12.1	31.0	10.0	15.5
#3 Collect data on meritorious counselors (n=49)	30.6	36.7	24.5	4.1	4.1
#4 Evaluate data on meritorious counselors (n=50)	38.0	28.0	26.0	6.0	2.0
#5 Write counseling accountability standards (n=66)	3.0	6.1	28.8	37.9	24.2
#6 Evaluate accountability standards (n=67)	7.5	7.5	25.4	37.3	22.4
#7 Evaluate school accountability studies (n=62)	9.7	19.4	27.4	25.8	17.7
#8 Disseminate licensing/credential information (n=67)	14.9	26.9	29.9	11.9	16.4
#9 Write for journals (n=68)	7.4	39.7	29.4	19.1	4.4
#10 Write special guidance programs (n=66)	4.5	22.7	36.4	18.2	18.2

Continued

Table 14. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#11 Collect data on excellence in counseling (n=68)	4.5	22.7	36.4	18.2	18.2
#12 Collect data for legislative action (n=67)	9.0	16.4	26.9	26.9	20.9

Note. Likert scale for importance: 1 = unimportant;
2 = less importance; 3 = important; 4 = very
important; 5 = essential.

Table 15. Research Job Functions by Time Spent Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in research (n=39)	12.8	35.9	35.9	15.4	0.0
#2 Conduct statewide school audits (n=56)	33.9	32.1	25.0	7.2	1.8
#3 Collect data on meritorious counselors (n=49)	66.7	25.0	6.3	0.0	2.0
#4 Evaluate data on meritorious counselors (n=49)	67.3	24.5	6.2	2.0	0.0
#5 Write counseling accountability standards (n=64)	20.3	48.3	21.9	6.3	3.2
#6 Evaluate accountability standards (n=64)	26.6	40.6	21.8	9.4	1.6
#7 Evaluate school accountability studies (n=59)	35.6	37.3	20.3	3.4	3.4
#8 Disseminate data licensing/credentials (n=66)	22.7	34.8	31.8	6.1	4.6
#9 Write for journals (n=66)	53.0	37.9	6.1	3.0	0.0
#10 Write special guidance programs (n=65)	20.0	49.2	23.1	6.2	1.5

Continued

Table 15. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#11 Determine counseling excellence (n=67)	16.4	29.9	32.8	11.9	9.0
#12 Collect data for legislative action (n=64)	20.3	48.4	20.3	4.7	6.3

Note. Likert scale for time spent ratings: 1 = never get to it; 2 = once or twice a year; 3 = once or twice a month; 4 = once or twice a week; 5 = a daily task.

Table 16. Research Job Functions by Effectiveness Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in research (n=37)	5.4	2.7	37.8	48.6	5.4
#2 Conduct statewide school audits (n=49)	10.2	10.2	40.8	24.5	14.3
#3 Collect data on meritorious counselors (n=36)	19.4	16.7	44.4	19.4	0.0
#4 Evaluate data on meritorious counselors (n=38)	21.1	15.8	42.1	21.1	0.0
#5 Write counseling accountability standards (n=61)	4.9	3.3	36.1	45.9	9.8
#6 Evaluate accountability standards (n=57)	5.3	3.5	33.3	52.6	5.3
#7 Evaluate school accountability studies (n=50)	8.0	10.0	40.0	38.0	4.0
#8 Disseminate data licensing/credentials (n=59)	10.2	8.5	41.4	28.8	10.2
#9 Write for journals (n=52)	7.7	15.4	36.5	36.5	3.8
#10 Write special guidance programs (n=58)	3.4	8.6	34.5	39.7	13.8

Continued

Table 16. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#11 Determine counseling excellence (n=65)	6.2	4.6	38.5	38.5	12.3
#12 Collect data for legislative action (n=60)	6.7	5.0	41.7	40.0	6.7

Note. Likert scale for effectiveness: 1 = undesirable results; 2 = ineffective; 3 = uncertain; 4 = adequate success; 5 = successful results.

Table 17. Research Job Functions by Future Trends Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in research (n=36)	5.6	0.0	47.2	41.7	5.5
#2 Conduct statewide school audits (n=54)	11.1	13.0	46.3	22.2	7.4
#3 Collect data on meritorious counselors (n=45)	11.1	15.6	57.8	13.3	2.2
#4 Evaluate data on meritorious counselors (n=46)	15.2	10.9	63.0	8.7	2.2
#5 Write counseling accountability standards (n=64)	1.6	3.1	45.3	28.1	21.9
#6 Evaluate accountability standards (n=62)	1.6	4.8	46.8	30.6	16.1
#7 Evaluate school accountability studies (n=57)	5.3	10.5	49.1	26.3	8.8
#8 Disseminate data licensing/credentials (n=63)	7.9	7.9	60.3	19.0	4.8
#9 Write for journals (n=62)	3.2	9.7	66.1	21.0	0.0
#10 Write special guidance programs (n=62)	1.6	4.8	59.7	24.2	9.7

Continued

Table 17. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#11 Determine counseling excellence (n=67)	6.0	1.5	52.2	25.4	14.9
#12 Collect data for legislative action	6.3	4.7	57.8	23.4	7.8

Note. Likert scale for future trends: 1 = disappearing fast; 2 = less emphasis; 3 = no changes; 4 = moderate emphasis; 5 = greatest emphasis.

These unimportant functions were #3--collect data for the meritorious school counselor and #4--evaluate data on meritorious school counselors. Two other functions, #8--disseminate licensing/credentialing information and #9--write for the journals--had more than 40% of the ratings as unimportant (1 or 2).

Time spent. The second variable to be evaluated in the research role was time spent (see Table 15). None of the research functions were considered by most of the consultants to require weekly or daily attention (ratings of 4 and 5). The highest combined percentage (20.9%) was function #10--to write or evaluate materials for specialized guidance programs.

The 10 research role functions received very little, if any, time (ratings of 1 and 2). The only function in the research role that received more than yearly attention by most of the consultants was #10--to write and evaluate materials for specialized guidance programs.

Effectiveness. The third variable to be evaluated in the research role was effectiveness (see Table 16). None of these functions had better than 60% of the combined ratings (4 and 5) to indicate adequate or successful results. However, four of the functions had a combined percentage of ratings of better than 50%. These functions were #5--write accountability standards for school counselors, #6--evaluate accountability standards for school counselors, #10--write

and evaluate materials for specialized guidance programs, and #11--collect general data on excellence in counseling.

None of the 11 specific functions of the research role were rated as ineffective or producing undesirable results (ratings of 1 and 2) with better than 40% of the responses. However, six of the functions were rated as uncertain in effectiveness (rating 3) with better than 40% of the responses. These six functions were #2--conduct statewide school audits, #3--collect data to determine the meritorious school counselor, #4--evaluate the data to determine the meritorious school counselor, #7--evaluate accountability studies at the school district level, #8--disseminate information concerning licensing/credentialing procedures, and #12--collect statistical data for legislative action.

Future trends. The fourth variable to be evaluated in the research role was future trends (see Table 17). None of the 11 specific functions had better than 60% of the combined ratings (4 and 5) to indicate moderate to great emphasis in the future role of DOE consultants. However, all of the functions were considered by better than 60% of the respondents to remain unchanged to moderate emphasis (rating 3 and 4) in the future role of research.

None of the research functions were considered to have less emphasis or to disappear (ratings of 2 and 1) by more than 30% of the respondents.

Professional Development Job Functions

The professional development role has been defined as program developer, a liaison to universities and legislatures, and one who participates in the professional organizations. The consultants' perceptions of the professional development role job functions are contained in Tables 18, 19, 20, and 21. Each job function evaluation has been presented in terms of percentages for each Likert-scale rating in each categorical variable.

Importance. The first variable to be evaluated was importance of the professional development functions (see Table 18). Of the 10 specific items listed under this role, four functions were considered to be very important to essential (ratings of 4 and 5) by more than 60% of the respondents. Those functions were #2--represent the state at national and regional conferences, #4--actively participate in the professional organizations, #7--work with counselor educators to develop programs for training counselors to meet state guidelines, and #8--plan and/or coordinate some statewide or regional conventions or conferences with the professional counseling organizations.

None of the functions for professional development were considered unimportant to less important (ratings of 1 and 2) by more than 60% of the respondents. However, function #11--teach counselor-education courses at state universities, was considered unimportant to less important by 57.6% of the respondents.

Table 18. Professional Development Job Functions by Importance.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in professional development (n=40)	5.0	2.5	5.0	38.0	50.0
#2 Represent the state at conferences (n=68)	2.9	5.9	23.5	42.6	25.0
#3 Recruiting and placement for counselors (n=65)	10.8	32.3	35.4	13.8	7.7
#4 Participate in professional organizations (n=71)	0.0	2.9	18.6	40.0	38.6
#5 Hold offices in committees (n=67)	3.0	23.9	26.9	34.3	11.9
#6 Counselor education workshops (n=64)	9.4	15.6	26.6	31.3	17.2
#7 Train counselors for state guidelines (n=68)	2.9	4.4	16.2	44.1	32.3
#8 Plan conventions (n=68)	0.0	5.9	27.9	32.3	33.8
#9 Conduct local programs for counseling organizations (n=64)	12.5	14.1	31.3	28.1	14.1

Continued

Table 18. Continued.

Function	<u>Percent of responses in each rating</u>				
	1	2	3	4	5
#10 Liaison between professional counseling organizations and legislatures (n=60)	8.3	21.7	26.7	25.0	18.3
#11 Teach counselor education courses at universities (n=59)	18.6	39.0	27.1	10.2	5.1

Note. Likert scale for importance: 1 = unimportant; 2 = less importance; 3 = important; 4 = very important; 5 = essential.

Table 19. Professional Development Job Functions by Time Spent Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in professional development (n=39)	5.1	10.3	41.0	35.9	7.7
#2 Represent the state at conferences (n=64)	9.4	68.8	20.3	1.6	0.0
#3 Recruit and place counselors (n=64)	21.9	46.9	29.7	1.6	0.0
#4 Participate in professional organizations (n=66)	0.0	25.8	50.0	18.2	6.1
#5 Officer in committees (n=63)	25.4	33.3	19.0	17.5	4.8
#6 Conduct workshops for counselors (n=62)	27.4	46.8	16.1	6.5	3.2
#7 Train counselors for state guidelines (n=65)	15.4	47.7	29.2	3.1	4.6
#8 Plan conventions (n=65)	0.0	3.1	13.8	44.6	38.5
#9 Conduct local programs for counseling organizations (n=61)	26.2	52.5	18.0	1.6	1.6

Continued

Table 19. Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#10 Liaison between organizations and legislatures (n=51)	31.0	41.4	24.1	1.7	1.7
#11 Teach counselor education courses at universities (n=56)	48.2	42.9	1.8	7.1	0.0

Note. Likert scale for time spent: 1 = never get to it;
 2 = once or twice a year; 3 = once or twice a month;
 4 = once a twice a week; 5 = a daily task.

Table 20. Professional Development Job Functions by Effectiveness Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in professional development (n=39)	5.1	2.6	7.7	48.7	35.9
#2 Represent the state at conferences (n=60)	1.7	1.7	28.3	51.7	16.7
#3 Recruit and place counselors (n=55)	5.5	5.5	41.8	41.8	5.5
#4 Participate in professional organizations (n=67)	0.0	1.5	17.9	52.2	28.4
#5 Officer in committees (n=61)	1.6	6.6	21.3	45.9	23.0
#6 Conduct workshops for counselors (n=59)	5.1	5.1	23.7	45.8	20.3
#7 Train counselors for state guidelines (n=63)	1.6	6.3	20.6	54.0	17.5
#8 Plan conventions (n=65)	0.0	3.1	13.8	44.5	38.5
#9 Conduct local programs for counseling organizations (n=56)	3.6	10.7	30.4	28.6	26.8

Continued

Table 20 Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#10 Liaison between organizations and legislatures (n=51)	5.9	11.8	31.4	43.1	7.8
#11 Teach counselor education courses at universities (n=47)	12.8	10.6	23.4	36.2	17.0

Note. Likert scale for effectiveness: 1 = undesirable results; 2 = clearly ineffective; 3 = uncertain; 4 = adequate success; 5 = successful results.

Table 21. Professional Development Job Functions by Future Trends Ratings.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#1 General role in professional development (n=39)	5.1	5.1	29.5	43.6	25.6
#2 Represent the state at conferences (n=64)	1.6	10.9	48.4	29.7	9.4
#3 Recruit and place counselors (n=63)	9.5	15.9	57.1	17.5	0.0
#4 Participate in professional organizations (n=71)	1.4	2.9	44.3	40.0	11.4
#5 Officer in committees (n=65)	7.7	7.7	52.3	21.5	10.8
#6 Conduct workshops for counselors (n=62)	8.1	6.5	46.8	25.8	12.9
#7 Train counselors for state guidelines (n=67)	6.0	1.5	41.8	35.8	14.9
#8 Plan conventions (n=68)	2.9	1.5	48.5	27.9	19.1
#9 Conduct local programs for counseling organizations (n=61)	6.6	3.3	59.0	24.6	8.2

Continued

Table 21 Continued.

Function	Percent of responses in each rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
#10 Liaison between organizations and legislatures (n=58)	8.6	10.3	53.4	19.0	8.6
#11 Teach counselor education courses at universities (n=56)	14.3	24.3	55.4	12.5	3.6

Note. Likert scale for future trends: 1 = disappearing fast; 2 = moving away from this type of work; 3 = no changes; 4 = moderate emphasis; 5 = greatest emphasis.

Time spent. The second variable to be evaluated in the professional development role was time spent (see Table 19). Only one function was considered to be a daily or weekly task (ratings of 4 and 5) for more than 60% of the respondents. This function was #8--plan and/or coordinate some statewide or regional conventions or conferences with the professional counseling organizations.

Seven functions of the professional development role were considered a task that never needed attention or it needed attention only once or twice a year (ratings of 1 and 2) by more than 60% of the respondents. These functions were #2--represent the state at national and regional conventions, #3--assist local school districts in coordinating counselor recruitment and placement, #6--plan and/or coordinate counselor education workshops at state universities, #7--work with counselor educators to develop programs for training counselors to meet state guidelines, #9--plan and conduct local school district programs for the professional counseling organization, #10--liaison between organizations and legislatures, and #11--teach counselor education courses at state universities.

Effectiveness. The third variable to be evaluated in the professional development role was effectiveness (see Table 20). Six of the 11 specific functions were considered to produce adequate to successful results (ratings of 4 and 5) by more than 60% of the respondents. These six functions were #2--represent the state at national and regional

conferences, #4--actively participate in professional organizations, #5--hold offices in professional organization committees, #6--plan and/or coordinate counselor education workshops at state universities, #7--work with counselor educators to develop programs for training counselors to meet state guidelines, and #8--plan and/or coordinate some statewide or regional conventions or conferences with the professional counseling organizations.

None of the functions in professional development were considered to generate undesirable results or be clearly ineffective (ratings of 1 and 2) by more than 25% of the respondents. The one function considered ineffective by the consultants with 23.4% of the ratings in 1 and 2 was #11--teach counselor-education courses at state universities.

Future trends. The fourth variable to be evaluated in the professional development role was future trends (see Table 21). None of the specific functions were predicted to have moderate to great emphasis in the future role (ratings of 4 and 5) by more than 60% of the respondents. However, one function did receive better than a combined percentage of better than 50% in these ratings. This function was #4--actively participate in the professional organizations.

Assigned Functions

The number of respondents was different in many of the preceding job function evaluations because of incomplete

returned questionnaires. Generally, the consultants indicated on the questionnaire an "NA," which was taken to mean the function was not part of their responsibilities. Other consultants indicated on the questionnaire that the function was part of some other division or program of the DOE. Therefore, the assigned responsibilities were tabulated to determine a national picture of the total assigned responsibilities of the consultants in each state. Table 22 contains a summary of each of the four role job function assignments for each state. This table shows the total number of items to which a consultant responded for each role. To be completed, each item had to be evaluated in all four categories (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends).

Comparisons of Data

The data analyses found in the following sections provide indications about the possible influence of the independent variables (the job functions of the four roles of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development) on the intervening test variable of job satisfaction. In turn, job satisfaction is then examined in relation to importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends.

The level of job satisfaction of the DOE consultants was estimated by summing the Likert-scaled responses to positively-stated comments regarding work and professional

Table 22. Total Assigned Job Functions in Each of the Four Roles for the DOE Consultants as Indicated by Completed Questionnaires.

State	L/M role	Con. role	Res. role	P.D. role	Total
Ark.	12	10	12	11	45
Ariz.	11	9	11	10	41
Calif.	12	10	12	11	45
Col.	11	10	12	11	44
Conn.	8	8	12	8	36
Del.	12	9	11	10	42
Fla.	11	8	12	11	42
Ga.	12	10	12	11	45
Haw.	8	10	7	8	33
Ida.	11	9	12	11	43
Ill.	12	10	11	10	43
Iowa	11	10	12	11	44
Kan.	12	10	12	11	45
Ky.	11	10	10	11	42
La.	12	10	12	11	45
Me.	9	9	8	7	32
Md.	12	10	12	11	45
Mass.	12	10	11	10	43
Minn.	6	9	7	5	27
Miss.	8	10	8	5	31
Mo.	7	6	3	5	21
Mont.	8	7	4	8	27

Continued

Table 22. Continued.

State	L/M role	Con. role	Res. role	P.D. role	Total
Neb.	12	8	12	10	42
N.J.	11	10	11	10	42
N. Mex.	4	4	5	5	18
N.Y.	10	10	5	8	33
N.C.	7	6	10	8	31
N.D.	12	10	12	11	45
Ohio	9	10	9	7	35
Okla.	10	9	11	10	40
Ore.	9	9	10	10	38
Pa.	8	9	9	10	36
R.I.	11	10	11	10	42
S.C.	11	10	11	11	43
S.D.	10	9	11	10	40
Tenn.	12	10	1	10	33
Tex.	10	10	9	9	38
Ver.	9	9	7	8	33
Va.	8	10	8	7	33
Wash.	5	4	2	2	13
W. Va.	11	9	12	11	42
Wisc.	11	10	8	11	40
Wyom.	11	10	6	6	33
Total =	<u>428</u>	<u>390</u>	<u>403</u>	<u>391</u>	<u>1,612</u>
\bar{X} =	9.95	9.07	9.37	9.09	37.49

opinions. A positive attitude of job satisfaction was implied in each statement. The respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement with each statement (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The highest sums of the consultants' responses, therefore, represented the highest level of job satisfaction, and the lowest sums suggested low levels of job satisfaction.

An index to divide the DOE consultants' job satisfaction into three levels (high, medium, and low) was obtained by compiling a ranked frequency table of the sums. The distribution of sums was then divided into the three levels of satisfaction. Table 23 contains information about the distribution of the levels of job satisfaction.

Of the 71 respondents who completed the section of the questionnaire that was concerned with job satisfaction (Part 3 of the questionnaire in Appendix A), 22 were placed at the high level of job satisfaction. The range of the sums for high satisfaction was from 111 to 146, with an average of 119.9. Those consultants who were deemed to have a medium level of job satisfaction were within a range of 100 to 110, with an average of 105.65. Twenty-three consultants were deemed to have low levels of job satisfaction because their sums were in the lowest range of 56 to 98. The average of the consultants with low job satisfaction was 88.95.

Table 23. Distribution of Levels of Job Satisfaction.

Level	Range	f	\bar{X}	SD
High	111-146	22	119.9	9.83
Medium	100-110	26	105.65	3.52
Low	56-98	23	88.95	11.35

Leadership/Management Role Function Ratings as a Function of Job Satisfaction

There were four null hypotheses proposed in the leadership/management role. The hypotheses focused on differences in consultants' perceptions of job functions rated in the categorical variables (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends) as a function of low, medium and high job satisfaction. This section reports the results of testing the null hypotheses ($p. < .05$) (see Tables 24 and 25).

Importance. The first variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was importance.

H₀ #1--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' leadership/management job functions when rated by importance as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the importance variable indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 3.60. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the importance variable. No significant differences were found in the pairwise comparisons.

Table 24. Analysis of Variance Summaries for Leadership/
Management Functions.

Category	DF	MS	F	p. > F
Importance				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.4895	3.60*	.0330
Error	65	.4141		
Time Spent				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.4666	4.11*	.0209
Error	65	.2549		
Effectiveness				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.2204	4.01*	.0229
Error	65	.3046		
Future Trends				
Job Satisfaction	2	.6565	1.74	.1835
Error	65	.3772		

*Significant at .05 level.

Table 25. Means of Job Satisfaction Groups in Leadership/
Management Role x Categorical Variables.

Category	Satisfaction Groups		
	Low	Medium	High
	n=22	n=26	n=20
Importance	3.14	3.56	3.60
Time Spent	2.32*	2.66	2.73*
Effectiveness	3.32*	3.68	3.77*
Future Trends	3.25	3.57	3.50

Note. The astrisk indicates the means between which significant differences were found using the Tukey Test.

Time Spent. The second variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was time spent.

H₀ #2--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' leadership/management job functions when rated by time spent as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the time spent variable indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 4.11. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the time spent variable. There were significant differences between the consultants with high job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction.

Effectiveness. The third variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was effectiveness.

H₀ #3--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' leadership/management job functions when rated by effectiveness as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the effectiveness variable indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 4.01. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the effectiveness variable. There

were significant differences between the consultants with high job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction.

Future trends. The fourth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was future trends.

H₀ #4--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' leadership/management job functions when rated by future trends as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the future trends variable indicated no significant differences. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Consultation Role Function Ratings as a Function of Job Satisfaction

There were four null hypotheses proposed in the consultation role. The hypotheses focused on differences in consultants' perceptions of job functions rated in the categorical variables (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends) as a function of low, medium, and high levels of job satisfaction. This section reports the results of testing the null hypotheses ($p < .05$) (see Tables 26 and 27).

Importance. The fifth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was importance.

H₀ #5--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' consultation job functions when rated by importance as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

Table 26. Analysis of Variance Summaries for Consultation Job Functions.

Category	DF	MS	F	p. > F
Importance				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.8146	4.77*	.0118
Error	63	.3807		
Time Spent				
Job Satisfaction	2	.8277	3.50*	.0363
Error	63	.2366		
Effectiveness				
Job Satisfaction	2	.6160	1.64	.2013
Error	63	.3746		
Future Trends				
Job Satisfaction	2	.5515	1.54	.2250
Error	63	.3583		

*Significant at .05 level.

Table 27. Means of Job Satisfaction Groups in Consultation
x Categorical Variables.

Category	Satisfaction Groups		
	Low	Medium	High
	n=21	n=26	n=20
Importance	3.23*	3.56	3.85*
Time Spent	2.57*	2.77	3.00*
	n=20	n=26	n=20
Effectiveness	3.47	3.58	3.82
Future Trends	3.29	3.51	3.62

Note. The astrisk indicates the means between which significant differences were found using the Tukey Test.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the importance variable indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 4.77. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the importance variable. There were significant differences between the consultants with high job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction (see Table 27).

Time spent. The sixth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was time spent.

H₀ #6--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' consultation job functions when rated by time spent as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the importance variables indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 3.50. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which the significant differences existed in the ratings of the time spent variable. There were significant differences between the consultants with high job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction.

Effectiveness. The seventh variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was effectiveness.

H₀ #7--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' consultation job functions when rated by effectiveness as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the effectiveness variable indicated no significant differences were present in the consultants' ratings. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Future trends. The eighth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was future trends.

H₀ #8--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' consultation job functions when rated by future trends as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance procedures on levels of job satisfaction with the future trends variable indicated no significant differences. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Research Role Function Ratings as a Function of Job Satisfaction

There were four null hypotheses proposed in the research role. The hypotheses focused on differences in consultants' perceptions of job functions rated in the categorical variables (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends) as a function of low, medium, and high levels of job satisfaction. This section reports the results of testing the null hypotheses ($p < .05$) (see Tables 28 and 29).

Table 28. Analysis of Variance Summaries for Research Functions.

Category	DF	MS	F	p. > F
Importance				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.9394	3.79*	.0281
Error	62	.5122		
Time Spent				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.0122	4.07*	.0219
Error	62	.2490		
Effectiveness				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.6578	3.36*	.0411
Error	62	.4932		
Future Trends				
Job Satisfaction	2	.5620	1.95	.1503
Error	62	.2875		

*Significant at .05 level.

Table 29. Means of Job Satisfaction Groups in Research x Categorical Variables.

Category	Satisfaction Groups		
	Low	Medium	High
	n=21	n=26	n=20
Importance	2.76*	3.12	3.36*
	n=21	n=25	n=20
Time Spent	1.89*	2.14	2.32*
	n=20	n=25	n=20
Effectiveness	3.00*	3.40	3.55*
	n=21	n=26	n=20
Future Trends	3.04	3.35	3.24

Note. The astrisk indicates the means between which significant differences were found using the Tukey Test.

Importance. The ninth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was importance.

H₀ #9--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' research job functions when rated by importance as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance levels of job satisfaction with the importance variable indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 3.79. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the importance variables. There were significant differences between the consultants with high job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction.

Time spent. The tenth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was time spent.

H₀ #10--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' research job functions when rated by time spent as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the time spent variable indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 4.07. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the time spent variable. There were significant differences between the consultants with high job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction.

Effectiveness. The eleventh variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was effectiveness.

H₀ #11--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' research job functions when rated by effectiveness as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the effectiveness variable indicated a significant omnibus F ration of 3.36. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the effectiveness variable. There were significant differences between the consultants with high job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction.

Future trends. The twelfth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was future trends.

H₀ #12--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' research job functions when rated by future trends as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the future trends variable indicated no significant differences were present in the consultants' ratings. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Professional Development Role Function Ratings as a Function of Job Satisfaction

There were four null hypotheses proposed in the professional development role. The hypotheses focused on differences in consultants' perceptions of job functions rated in

the categorical variables (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends) as a function of low, medium and high levels of job satisfaction. This section reports the results of testing the null hypotheses ($p. < .05$) (see Tables 30 and 31).

Importance. The thirteenth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was importance.

H₀ #13--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' professional development job functions when rated by importance as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the importance variable indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 3.36. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the importance variable. There were significant differences between the consultants with high job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction.

Time spent. The fourteenth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was time spent.

H₀ #14--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' professional development job functions when rated by time spent as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the time spent variable indicated no

Table 30. Analysis of Variance Summaries for Professional Development Functions.

Category	DF	MS	F	p. > F
Importance				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.6435	3.36*	.0409
Error	63	.4886		
Time Spent				
Job Satisfaction	2	.5357	1.78	.1766
Error	63	.3006		
Effectiveness				
Job Satisfaction	2	.9612	2.13	.1271
Error	63	.4508		
Future Trends				
Job Satisfaction	2	1.6750	4.03*	.0226
Error	63	.4161		

* Significant at .05 level.

Table 31. Means of Job Satisfaction Groups in Research x Categorical Variables.

Category	Satisfaction Groups		
	Low	Medium	High
	n=21	n=26	n=20
Importance	3.23*	3.41	3.78*
	n=21	n=25	n=20
Time Spent	2.18	2.37	2.49
Effectiveness	3.56	3.76	4.00
	n=21	n=26	n=20
Future Trends	2.94*	3.46*	3.42

Note. The astrisk indicates the means between which significant differences were found using the Tukey Test.

significant differences were present in the consultants' ratings. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Effectiveness. The fifteenth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was effectiveness.

H₀ #15--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' professional development job functions when rated by effectiveness as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the effectiveness variable indicated no significant differences. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Future trends. The sixteenth variable of the investigation related to job satisfaction was future trends.

H₀ #16--There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of state consultants' professional development job functions when rated by future trends as a function of low, medium, or high levels of job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance on levels of job satisfaction with the future trends variable indicated a significant omnibus F ratio of 4.03. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The Tukey studentized range (HSD) test was used to determine the means between which significant differences existed in the ratings of the future trends variable in professional development job functions. There were significant differences between the consultants with medium job satisfaction and those with low job satisfaction.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study focused on the clarification and evaluation of the role of DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling. A survey questionnaire was sent to DOE consultants who had school guidance supervision assigned to them. The purpose of the questionnaire was to collect personal and professional information about the consultants in order to provide a national profile of this position. The questionnaire was also developed to gather data regarding the personal perceptions about their job functions and level of job satisfaction.

Analysis of variance procedures tested 16 null hypotheses regarding the influence of three levels of job satisfaction on the mean categorical ratings (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends) of the job functions in the four major roles of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development. Of the 16 null hypotheses, nine were rejected with $\alpha = .05$.

Significant differences in the mean categorical ratings of job functions were found between high and low, or medium

and low levels of job satisfaction in all four roles. These differences were determined through the use of the Tukey studentized range (HSD) test for each categorical variable.

Therefore, satisfied consultants may see their job functions differently from those with low levels of job satisfaction. This study supports the recent evidence from Caldwell and O'Reilly (1982) who suggested that perceptual assessments of job functions may be affected by the extent of job satisfaction.

Conclusions

This study was designed to answer three research questions about the DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling. First, information about the general profile of the DOE consultant is presented, followed by a discussion about the job functions in each of the four major roles. This discussion centers around the consultants' ratings of the four variables (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends) for the specific job functions in each role. Next, the level of the consultants' job satisfaction relative to the ratings of the four categorical variables for the job functions is discussed.

General Profile

The description of the person and of the position as the DOE consultant to school guidance and counseling has changed since the Camp (1964) study of guidance supervisors

and Heddesheimer's (1978) report. Males continue to dominate the position, but in a much lower ratio of 2:1 as opposed to 5:1 (Camp, 1964). The average age has decreased by three years from 49 to 46 years of age. But the average salary has increased since 1964 by a factor of greater than four (from \$8,831 to \$34,375).

The educational qualifications of the consultants have also increased since the Camp (1964) study from 22.86% with doctorates to 29.1% with doctorates at the time of this study, 1986. This figure of 29.1% combines the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. Also, 70 out of the 71 responding consultants have a master's degree or better.

But decreases have appeared in the DOE consultants' professional counseling organization memberships. These decreases seem to indicate that the relationship between the state DOE consultants and the professional organization of ACES (Association for Counselor Education and Supervision) is limited and nonsupportive. At the time of the Heddesheimer (1978) report, 51% of the state guidance supervisors were member of ACES. At the time of this study, only 29% were members. Also, many of the consultants reported that they did not work with the local or state organizations to conduct workshops.

Generally, the DOE consultants have had an average of 10 years counseling experience prior to the time they entered their present positions. In their present positions they had an average of eight years experience. The average

consultant had approximately 18 years in the counseling profession as either a counselor or a supervisor for counseling services.

Therefore, the typical DOE consultant, nationwide, at the time of this study was a 46 years old male with a salary of \$34,375. He or she had a master's degree and was a member of the American Association for Counseling and Development. He or she held no other national professional counseling organization memberships. He or she entered the position of state consultant to guidance and counseling with an average of 10 years experience in counseling and he or she had been a DOE consultant for about 8 years.

Job Function Profile of the DOE Consultants to School Guidance and Counseling

The following job functions, as listed by major role and indicated by item numbers from the questionnaire, are rated the highest in three out of four categorical variables (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends) by 60% of the respondents.

There were 11 specific job functions listed in the leadership/management role. The following three items were rated highest.

- #2--Develop and revise a statewide guidance plan
(importance, effectiveness, and future trends).
- #4--Evaluate school guidance programs (importance,
effectiveness and future trends).

#7--Maintain and/or contribute to a statewide communication network for school counselors (importance, effectiveness, and future trends).

There were nine specific job functions listed in the consultation role. The following four items were rated highest.

#3--Consult with other DOE consultants in the same state (importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends).

#7--Consult with school district supervisors to guidance and counseling (importance, effectiveness, future trends).

#8--Consult with individual school counselors (importance, time spent, effectiveness, future trends).

#10--Consult with university counselor-educators (importance, effectiveness, and future trends).

There were 11 specific job functions listed in the research role. The following two items were rated highest.

#5--Write accountability standards for school counselors (importance, effectiveness, and future trends).

#6--Evaluate accountability standards for school counselors (importance, effectiveness, and future trends).

There were 10 specific job functions listed in the professional development role. Only one was rated highest.

#8--Plan and/or coordinate some statewide or regional conventions or conferences with the professional counseling organizations (importance, time spent, and effectiveness).

Therefore, the role of the DOE consultant includes nine functions. These functions are considered by at least 60% of the respondents to be the most important now and in the future. The functions were also considered to be the work in which consultants believed they were most effective.

The following list includes these job functions.

1. Develop and revise a statewide guidance plan.
2. Evaluate school guidance programs.
3. Maintain and/or contribute to a statewide communication network for school counselors.
4. Consult with other DOE consultants in the same state.
5. Consult with school district supervisors to guidance and counseling.
6. Consult with individual school counselors.
7. Consult with university counselor-educators.
8. Write accountability standards for school counselors.
9. Evaluate accountability standards.

The following job functions, listed by major role and item number, were rated the lowest in three out of four categorical variables by 60% of the respondents or more.

Of the 11 specific job functions listed in the leadership/management role, three were lowest in ratings.

#6--Assist in local school district budget planning
(importance, time spent, and effectiveness).

#12--Coordinate statewide testing program (importance,
time spent, and effectiveness).

#9--Coordinate career education grants--also rated very
low but only by 40% of the respondents in the
categories of importance, time spent, and future
trends.

None of the functions in the consultation role were
rated lowest by better than 60% of the respondents in three
or four categories.

None of the functions in the research role were rated
lowest by better than 60% of the respondents in three or
four categories.

None of the functions in the professional development
role were rated lowest by better than 60% of the respondents
in three or four categories.

Therefore, two job functions of the leadership/management role are considered by more than 60% of the respondents to be unimportant, requiring very little to no time, and producing ineffective to undesirable results. These functions are found the following list.

1. Assist in local school district budget planning.
2. Coordinate statewide testing programs.

The responses from the consultants indicated a lack of consensus (greater than 60%) about the remaining 30 of the 45 listed job functions. Therefore, the remaining 30 specific job functions are not clearly defined as part of their roles.

Profile of Assigned Responsibilities

According to the evaluation of the questionnaires for completed items in the four roles, there were seven states (Arkansas, California, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana and Maryland) where all 45 of the job functions were assigned to the DOE guidance consultants. The responding consultants indicated approximately 10 functions in the leadership/management role, nine functions in the consultation role, nine functions in the research role, and nine functions in the professional development role.

It appeared that state consultants to school guidance and counseling had an average of 37 specific job functions, based on this study, which were assigned as responsibilities.

The list of titles for the DOE consultants indicated that these positions were broadly defined nationwide. Most titles did not specify grade levels or an area of specialization. The job description in one state, for instance, may be different from the job description in any other state. The titles covered a wide range of unspecified responsibilities.

Influence of Job Satisfaction on Job Function Ratings

Most of this research investigating the categorical ratings of job functions in each of the four roles had presumed a causal ordering as a function of job satisfaction. The general hypothesis tested was that for DOE consultants holding the same position, those who were comparatively more satisfied perceived their assigned work differently from those who were less satisfied. The results of the analyses of variance indicated significant differences in the consultants' perceptions in all four roles of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development. The conservative Tukey Test was used to determine significant differences between pairs of means.

Leadership/management. Apparently all responding DOE consultants considered the leadership/management functions to be important regardless of their own level of job satisfaction. These consultants also indicated the same forecasts for the future emphasis on the leadership/management role functions without an influence of job satisfaction.

However, the consultants did rate time spent and effectiveness of leadership/management functions differently when described in levels of job satisfaction. These differences were found between those consultants' ratings with high and low levels of satisfaction.

Consultation. In the consultation role the DOE consultants perceived their job functions differently when comparisons were made in their ratings of those with high and low

job satisfactions. The ratings of the two variables, importance and time spent, were found to be significantly different between consultants with high and low levels of job satisfaction.

But, the responding consultants rated their effectiveness in the consultation role the same, regardless of their level of job satisfaction. They also forecast the future emphasis for the consultation role without differences.

Research. The consultants perceived their role related job functions in research differently in three categorical variables: importance, time spent, and effectiveness. Only future trends were seen without differences among the ratings in the three levels of job satisfaction. Again, the significant differences were found to exist between those consultants with high and low levels of job satisfaction in each of the variables of significance.

Professional development. In the professional development role the DOE consultants perceived their job functions by importance and future trends differently as a function of level of job satisfaction. The consultants who were grouped as highly satisfied rated importance differently from those who were grouped with low satisfaction. Those with medium satisfaction rated the future trends of professional development differently from those consultants who were grouped with low satisfaction.

Summary of Conclusions

The results of this study seem to indicate that, in spite of holding the same job, the consultants experience substantial variations in job titles and responsibilities. Job satisfaction also differs. For example, consultants who feel more satisfied with their jobs tend to rate the functions more positively.

Therefore, the results appear to indicate that job satisfaction may affect the DOE consultants' perceptions of their job functions in all four roles. More specifically, the DOE consultants rated the importance of and the time spent on their roles significantly different when examined by an intervening variable of job satisfaction. The two roles where most of the differences were found were leadership/management and research. These differences in the responding DOE consultant perceptions indicate a possibility of differences in job performance (Tharenou & Harker, 1982).

These consultants are viewed as leaders in the counseling profession (Erpenback, 1977; Geoffroy & Duncan, 1971; Herr, 1971) and need a positive attitude as they continuously work with many groups of people. Low job satisfaction would seem to be a major factor that could negate a positive attitude.

Limitations

There were some limitations to this study. The nature of the instrument, the data collected, and the interpretation of the items by the DOE consultants need to be considered.

The DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling were mailed an eight-page questionnaire that was divided into several parts. There were 99 items involving personal and professional information and professional perceptions. All job functions in each of four roles were listed and were to be evaluated in four categories. The information collected depended upon the consultants' abilities to accurately estimate each job function in each category.

There are several factors that may have contaminated the consultants' ratings for each category of each job function:

1. The job function may not have been an assigned responsibility for all consultants.
2. The consultants' responses may have been influenced by the length of time they were in the consultant position.
3. Most consultants have other DOE assignments and their estimation of the evaluation for each function may have been limited to their specified responsibilities.

Implications

There were several implications for the role of the DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling that resulted from the findings of this study. Generally, it appeared that the position was widely undefined and needed further clarification.

General National Profile

The number of women in the consultant position was increasing. Females are becoming recognized leaders in the school counseling profession. As leaders, both men and women need to develop and maintain a support network of communication among all DOE consultants to aid their acceptance and promote the professional growth of all consultants.

One potential source for support, professionalization, and revitalization is found within the professional counseling organizations. Yet, the participation of the DOE consultants in the professional organizations, specifically ASCA and ACES, was limited. Less than 50% of the consultants held memberships in these two organizations. This limited membership implied that many consultants may have been working in isolation and not have had the opportunity to learn from other professionals. Some consultants are missing the opportunities to gain insight into current issues and to revitalize their professional enthusiasm by not participating in the professional organizations.

One consultant mentioned that membership in the counseling organizations was not encouraged by the DOE division chiefs and that funds were not provided to maintain memberships or to attend conferences. However, many school counselors join and attend meetings with their own personal funds. If the DOE's are to maintain the designated leadership positions with legislative and public support, the consultants need the professional support the counseling organizations provide.

Another implication from the lack of participation in professional organizations by the DOE consultants was that they miss the opportunity to establish and maintain communication networks. Informal networks among colleagues and formal networks through organizational journals, seminars, or committee work; are both important vehicles of communication. But the DOE consultants have not yet established any communication networks. For example, the AACD 1986 convention in Los Angeles provided a program for the state consultants, but only about 12 attended. The consultants could provide an enriched professionalism to other consultants, counselor educators, school district supervisors, and individual school counselors if communication networks were established statewide and nationwide.

Leadership/Management Job Functions

The data collected about the job functions in leadership/management indicated that the consultants saw the

importance of maintaining a statewide communication network within the state for school counselors. If such a network were in operation in every state, much would be done to improve the professional identity of the counselors and the consultants. Important information could be shared concerning successful guidance programs, recruitment and/or placement possibilities, professional conferences and seminars, and new skills. But the data indicated that, though the consultants knew the importance and effectiveness of the communication network, they did not spend time on its development, operation, and maintenance. This implication is additionally substantiated from the indications of consultants that research and writing for journals were specified as functions requiring very little if any, time.

Another limited time effort by the consultants was the development of a state guidance plan. Perhaps guidance plans are being neglected nationwide after their initial development. Do consultants conduct needs assessments that evaluate the programs and point out changes to provide guidance services necessary for the student populations?

Another two functions, coordinating career education grants and coordinating a statewide testing program, were considered by the consultants as ineffective, unimportant, requiring no time and having no emphasis in their future roles. The implication appeared that these functions were no longer school guidance and counseling activities. Why, then are these functions delegated to individual school

counselors, if DOEs eliminated these tasks from the school counseling consultants' responsibilities?

Consultation Job Functions

Approximately 27% of the consultants indicated that they did not spend time with the state colleges and universities to teach counselor education courses. This item on the questionnaire may not have been worded appropriately. It was not meant to imply that the DOE consultants were paid teachers. Rather, the intent was to find out if the consultants helped or assisted in the preparation of counselor education students through such activities as guest lectures, workshops, or co-leading pre- or in-service programs.

The information from the questionnaires indicated that the DOE consultants work in isolation from higher education institutions where maximum efforts could be made to increase communication. DOE consultants can be a valuable source of information for counselor education students about such issues as credentialing, licensing, successful guidance programs, and employment opportunities. The DOE consultants need to work with the higher education faculties in each state.

The respondents indicated the importance of communicating and consulting with state legislators. But, about 69% of the consultants reported little or no time was spent in this function. Apparently some consultants were not permitted to communicate with the legislators and, therefore, were

not able to promote support for guidance in the state governments from where the main financial aid is directed.

The lack of communication is surprising since so many state legislators have, within the past decade, been influential in promoting guidance and counseling services in the schools. Legislators need to be informed and to have the opportunity to consult with counseling experts, such as the DOE consultants. It is unfortunate that some legislators must work independently from their state DOE's.

Research Job Functions

The DOE consultants considered the research role important, effective, and changing toward more emphasis in the future. However, they also indicated very little time was spent on research. With the current trend for accountability in programs, it would appear that research would demand more of the consultants' time. The contradiction here seems to imply that the consultants do not have the time to spend on research as other assigned tasks required more of their time. Also, no changes were predicted to increase the time spent in research.

The indications were also that the DOE consultants may lack skills in conducting research. Only 14% of them hold a doctorate, which requires strong research skills. Perhaps more people with doctorates should be in the DOE positions. Or it may be that the consultants need in-service training

in research. As their skills in research develop so may their confidence develop to continue the research effort. But if the DOE consultants neglect research at the state department level, how can they legitimately encourage research activities by individual school counselors?

Professional Development Job Functions

Seventy-eight percent of the consultants indicated the importance of participating in professional counseling organizations. However, in the tabulation of reported memberships, only 61% were members of AACD. There were even fewer members in ASCA (39%) and ACES (29%). Apparently the consultants recognized the importance and effectiveness of professional organization membership, but approximately 17% did not follow through with their convictions. Perhaps their salaries may have influenced their abilities to maintain memberships.

The time spent on liaison activities between professional organizations and the legislatures was indicated by more than 72% of the consultants to occur at most, only once or twice a year. It appears that a major leader of the school counseling profession, that of the DOE consultant, has not implemented an important strategy to promote school guidance programs. The strategy of combining the support of professional organizations with the support of the legislatures through communication from a state department

perspective was not considered very important, effective, or changing in its time demands in the future.

Job Satisfaction

As the consultants try to fulfill the myriad of extra responsibilities assigned to them, the once positive attitude may change and their level of job satisfaction generally decreases. With the decrease in job satisfaction usually comes an accompanying change in task perception. Priorities were not the same as indicated by the significant differences found in all four roles in the ratings of importance of job functions.

The data from this study indicated that job satisfaction does influence the DOE consultants' perceptions of their work. DOE consultants' job satisfaction needs attention. Job satisfaction may be changed through a re-sorting of the job responsibilities and a re-definition of the role to be served in the position. Role identity is necessary so that the consultant and the public may have a clear picture of the services provided by the person in the position.

Recommendations

The clarification and analysis of the role of the DOE consultants to school guidance and counseling merits continued examination because of the considerable variation in role perceptions reported by the individual respondents in this study. Only one factor, job satisfaction, was examined

as a function of the consultants' job perceptions. But a variety of factors may have been related to their level of job satisfaction such as the influence of the consultants' supervisors, co-worker relations, and individual personalities and needs. Also, because of the complexity of the roles, it is likely that no two positions may be defined alike.

For these reasons it is recommended that

1. the staff superintendent or chief of education and staff re-evaluate the adherence of the Pupil Personnel Service to the policy statement of the Council of Chief State School Officers (This policy contains the list of the important responsibilities for the PPS);
2. an adequate number of competent DOE consultants be employed in each state department guidance division in order to provide sufficient guidance supervisory services throughout the state;
3. a subsequent regional study and role analysis may indicate "pockets" within the United States where the counseling profession, especially the DOE consultant position, needs support and re-strengthening (Perhaps the professional counseling organizations need to be more active on this level. At least, the DOE consultants should be more active in the professional counseling

organizations in order to gain some professional support);

4. the DOE consultants maintain a daily log for the purposes of collecting data on the actual tasks each consultant performs over a period of time (The log would be especially useful to the department chiefs if an interest existed in maintaining priorities for the deliverance of guidance services to the state school population);
5. communication be initiated or improved between the DOE offices and the institutions of higher education, especially in the area of counselor education (This communication would help to provide up to date information concerning licensing, credentialing, other current legislation, effective guidance programs in operation, and even counselor placement);
6. an effort be made for continuity in the titles of the DOE consultants (This continuity would help to add strength to the total nationwide position because, if the position were eliminated most of the public who work with the counseling professionals would understand what functions were being taken away. The variety of titles does not help to clarify the role of the consultant. A consistency in the title nationwide may help to

- clarify functions served and the professional identity of the consultants); and
7. research be emphasized as a major role for the DOE consultants (The recent surge of public demands for excellence in our schools requires guidance program accountability. The counseling profession needs public and legislative support. It gains support through recognition of the results it produces. Accountability studies give access to the legislators to work for guidance support).

Summary Statement

It was evident that most states have someone in the DOE school counseling consultant position. However, these consultants have different job functions, different titles, and different perceptions of their work in terms of what was important, where the time was spent, what produced successful results, and what role was predicted for the future. A few states have no one in this leadership position and other states have provided very thorough supervision of the guidance services offered.

Despite the lack of consistency from state to state, there was agreement among a majority of consultants on nine of the 45 specific job functions in terms of importance, time spent, effectiveness, and future trends. The consultants tended to see themselves as effective in the work they considered important but an inconsistency appeared in the

amount of time spent on the same functions nationwide. Rarely did any job function receive more than monthly attention. Apparently, there was no daily routine for the consultants.

This lack of consistency may have influenced their job satisfaction. The findings of this study indicated that the consultants' perceptions of their role may have had an impact on their job satisfaction, especially in terms of importance and time.

In conclusion, a need exists for more clarification of what the DOE school counseling consultants do. Their professional identity was being diluted with the addition of many nonguidance responsibilities. Many DOE consultants worked in isolation from other state consultants, from professional counseling organizations, from counselor educators, and from state and federal legislators. In addition, they did not conduct research, write for the professional journals, nor provide accountability studies on the effectiveness of the work they did.

As a result, it may be that some state legislatures and DOEs consider the position of the school guidance consultant expendable. Factors such as the lack of public, professional, and legislative support certainly contribute to the idea of the consultants' expendability. The individual school counselors need effective state leadership to offer support, provide current information, conduct relevant research, and help them grow in professionalism. It is

difficult to put confidence in a leadership that appears so fragmented, undefined, and unproven.

However, the position of the DOE consultant to school counseling has a short history. This leadership position is still struggling for identity in the same way that school counselors must in the total educational system. In spite of the limited role of some DOE consultants, there were some consultants who received strong support from their DOE's and were able to maintain comprehensive guidance programs within their states. It may be that these DOE consultants with strong programs in guidance should serve as models for others who are struggling for identity and clarification of job functions.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER

Sample
Cover Letter

Date

Inside Address

Dear []:

The enclosed questionnaire is being sent to all states as part of a national study. It is a request for information concerning position and role responsibilities of DOE school guidance and counseling consultants.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this important study.

Please complete all four parts of the survey. Part I is general and you may want to send any readily available information that will help to clarify your position or the status of school guidance and counseling in your state. Guidance objectives are ranked in Part II. Job functions are evaluated in Part III, and some general opinions are requested in Part IV.

All information will be kept confidential and the data analysis will be across the United States. I will be happy to share the final report with you.

Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope as soon as possible. If you have any questions regarding the questionnaire or the study, please call me (904-669-4452). Thank you again for your help.

Sincerely,

STATE CONSULTANT SURVEY

PART I. Demographic Information

(Check the box to receive a summary of the results ☐)

Name: _____ Age: _____
 Title: _____ Sex: _____
 Mailing Address: _____ Salary: _____

Phone Number () _____
 extension: _____

Your highest degree? _____

From what university? _____

Area of specialization? _____

Years counseling experience? _____

Years in present position? _____

How many of the following?

High School Guidance Counselors: _____

Middle/Junior High Counselors: _____

Elementary School Counselors: _____

Local District Supervisors: _____

High School Enrollment: _____

Middle/Jr. High Enrollment: _____

Elementary Enrollment: _____

Professional Memberships: _____

General Instructions

The following two parts of the questionnaire are designed to elicit your personal perceptions and opinions about your work. Your job functions in the four roles of leadership/management, consultation, research, and professional development are to be evaluated by you in Part II. Your working conditions and job satisfaction are to be rated by you in Part III.

PART II: Ratings

DIRECTIONS: This part of the survey has been partitioned into four major job roles:

1. LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT ROLE (e.g. decision-maker, organizer, speaker, coordinator)
2. CONSULTATION ROLE (e.g. problem-solver, analyzer, counselor, clarifier, facilitator)
3. RESEARCH and ACCOUNTABILITY ROLE (e.g. writer, data collection, reporter, investigator, data disseminator, evaluator)
4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ROLE (e.g. participates in professional organizations, program developer, liaison to universities and legislatures)

Each role has been subdivided into related job functions. Please respond in terms of your own perceptions regarding IMPORTANCE, TIME SPENT, EFFECTIVENESS, AND FUTURE TRENDS. Use the following scales for reference to rate each job function.

IMPORTANCE	TIME SPENT	EFFECTIVENESS	FUTURE TRENDS
5 - Essential	5 - A daily task	5 - Successful results, very positive feedback	5 - Greatest emphasis in this type of function
4 - Very important	4 - Once or twice a week	4 - Adequate success, some positive feedback	4 - Moderate emphasis
3 - Important	3 - once or twice a month	3 - Effectiveness uncertain, very little feedback	3 - No changes indicated in this function
2 - Of less importance	2 - Once or twice a year	2 - Clearly ineffective for positive results	2 - Less emphasis--a moving away from this type of work
1 - Unimportant	1 - Never get to it	1 - Undesirable results, some negative feedback	1 - Disappearing fast, will no longer be involved with this type of work

JOB FUNCTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT ROLE:

IMPORTANCE	TIME SPENT	EFFECTIVENESS	FUTURE TRENDS
1. Evaluate your general role in leadership/management			
More specifically:			
2. Develop and revise a statewide guidance plan.			
3. Plan and/or organize school guidance programs (e.g. dropout prevention, substance abuse, child abuse, sex education).			
4. Evaluate school guidance programs.			
5. Coordinate and conduct statewide seminars and staff development programs.			
6. Assist in local school district budget planning.			
7. Help develop departmental D.O.E. budget.			
8. Work to gain state legislative action to aid guidance programs.			
9. Coordinate career education grants.			
10. Maintain and/or contribute to a statewide communication network for school counselors.			
11. Coordinate guidance services with other state bureaus, agencies, and/or local school boards.			
12. Coordinate statewide testing program			
13. Other:			

JOB FUNCTIONS OF THE CONSULTATION ROLE:

IMPORTANCE	TIME SPENT	EFFECTIVENESS	FUTURE TRENDS
14. Evaluate your general role in consultation activities.			
More specifically:			
15. Consult with guidance and counseling consultants in other states.			
16. Consult with the other D.O.E. consultants in the same state.			
17. Consult with state legislators or their staff.			
18. Consult with federal legislators or their staff.			
19. Consult with the members of the U.S. Office of Education.			
20. Consult with school district supervisors to guidance and counseling.			
21. Consult with individual school counselors.			
22. Consult with local businesses or special interest groups such as PTAs, Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions.			
23. Consult with university counselor-educators.			
24. Other:			

JOB FUNCTIONS OF THE RESEARCH ROLE:

IMPORTANCE	TIME SPENT	EFFECTIVENESS	FUTURE TRENDS
25. Evaluate your general role in research.			
More specifically:			
26. Conduct statewide school audits.			
27. Collect data to determine the meritorious school counselor.			
28. Evaluate the data to determine the meritorious school counselor.			
29. Write accountability standards for school counselors.			
30. Evaluate accountability standards for school counselors.			
31. Evaluate accountability studies at the school district level.			
32. Disseminate information concerning licensing/credentialing procedures.			
33. Write articles for the professional journals about current statewide research.			
34. Write and evaluate materials for specialized guidance programs (e.g. peer facilitators, new student orientation, self-concept improvement).			
35. Collect general data on excellence in counseling .			
36. Collect statistical data for legislative action.			
37. Others:			

JOB FUNCTIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ROLE:

IMPORTANCE	TIME SPENT	EFFECTIVENESS	FUTURE TRENDS
30. Evaluate your general role in professional development of counselors.			
More specifically:			
39. Represent the state at national and regional conferences.			
40. Assist local school districts in coordinating counselor recruitment and placement.			
41. Actively participate in the professional organizations.			
42. Hold offices in professional organization committees.			
43. Plan and/or coordinate counselor education workshops at state universities.			
44. Work with counselor-educators to develop programs for training counselors to meet state guidelines.			
45. Plan and/or coordinate some statewide or regional conventions or conferences to the professional counseling organizations.			
46. Plan and conduct local school district programs for the professional counseling organizations.			
47. Act as a liaison between the legislators and the professional counseling organization membership to provide current information for guidance program aid.			
48. Teach counselor-education courses at state universities.			
49. Other:			

PART III: Rate the following statements from your personal perspective according to the scale:

5 - Strongly Agree

4 - Agree

3 - Undecided

2 - Disagree

1 - Strongly Disagree

-
- ___ 1. I am able to fulfill the responsibilities of my position.
 - ___ 2. I am provided with adequate time in compensation for extra duties.
 - ___ 3. The DOE provides adequate staff assistance to meet the responsibilities of my position.
 - ___ 4. I am satisfied with my work in my present position.
 - ___ 5. The intrapersonal relationships of the DOE guidance and counseling division are good.
 - ___ 6. The relationship between the DOE staff and the state university personnel is good.
 - ___ 7. I am allowed great latitude and freedom in my work.
 - ___ 8. I enjoy the non-routine unpredictable situations in my work.
 - ___ 9. Counseling organizations in our state conduct an adequate number of local school district workshops and seminars.
 - ___ 10. The colleges and universities in this state regularly re-evaluate their counselor-education programs to meet state guidelines.
 - ___ 11. I am provided with adequate money compensation for extra duties.
 - ___ 12. The role of the state consultant is becoming less isolated from local district supervisors and school counselors.
 - ___ 13. I have the opportunity to conduct valuable research on a statewide basis.
 - ___ 14. The DOE guidance and counseling staff work efficiently to satisfy the state guidance program objectives.
 - ___ 15. The state-level meetings I must attend are productive.

- ___ 16. The paperwork responsibilities of my position are not excessive.
- ___ 17. Access to important facilities such as a WATS line and a computer network is adequate.
- ___ 18. My work does not infringe upon my personal life.
- ___ 19. The interpersonal relationships of the DOE staff are good.
- ___ 20. The responsibilities of the state consultant to school guidance and counseling are clear and well defined.
- ___ 21. I find my work as a state consultant challenging.
- ___ 22. I feel successful when I can influence others to be more effective.
- ___ 23. The professional counseling organizations are active at our state level.
- ___ 24. The professional counseling organizations are active at our local school district level.
- ___ 25. School counselors in this state are actively involved in the state professional organizations.
- ___ 26. The professional counseling organizations in this state work closely with the DOE guidance and counseling staff.
- ___ 27. The current evaluation standards for meritorious counselors in this state are comprehensive, fair, and provide the motivation for excellence.
- ___ 28. The working conditions (staff number and attitude, facilities, environment) in my DOE are excellent.
- ___ 29. There is not much turnover in the DOE personnel of this state.
- ___ 30. In the future this position will be adequately maintained to meet the growing demands of the counseling profession.

PLEASE WRITE ANY COMMENTS BELOW REGARDING THE MATERIAL OR EVALUATION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE:

APPENDIX B
THE HERR STUDY

Table 1

Appropriate Functions of the State Guidance Office
as Reported by School Counselors, Counselor Educators,
and State Supervisors of Guidance

90% or More Agreement

The development and dissemination of statistical, narrative, or special reports describing the status of guidance programs in the state

The development and the conducting of regional in-service programs for the upgrading of practicing counselors

The preparation and dissemination of publications pertaining to guidance designed to upgrade the competence of practicing counselors

The stimulation of the development of pilot demonstration projects in guidance in local school districts

The provision of liaison with other agencies of state government concerned with programs serving youth

The provision of liaison and consultative support to professional organizations outside of state government concerned with youth (i.e., professional educators associations, counselor organizations, etc.)

80% or More Agreement

The development of certification requirements for school counselors in all educational settings from K through 12

The review of local guidance programs for adherence to standards developed consistent with the state plan

The development of and the participation in activities designed to acquaint the public with the services available in local guidance programs

The development of standards for physical facilities necessary to the support of guidance programs

Table 1--Continued

The development of joint projects with other agencies of state government designed to evaluate or demonstrate guidance services

The provision of liaison and consultative support to lay organizations concerned with youth (e.g., State School Boards Association, State and local PTAs, Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs)

The provision in combination with counselor education programs, of regional in-service activities

The reviewing of state needs for and programs of guidance in cooperation with representatives of the U.S. Office of Education

The development and the conducting of statewide school dropout studies

75% or More Agreement

The conducting of pilot/demonstration projects in guidance in local districts

The supervision and evaluation of pilot demonstration projects in guidance in local districts

The development and dissemination of occupational and educational information for use in guidance programs

The development of statewide data retrieval systems in support of local guidance programs

Source: Herr, 1971

Table 2

Marginally Supported Functions (50-75% Agreement)
of State Guidance Office as Reported by School Counselors,
Counselor Educators, and State Supervisors of Guidance

The provision of regional continuing counseling practica for practicing school counselors

The evaluation of all local guidance programs and the determination of eligibility for state or federal reimbursement.

The provision of testing consultation to other agencies of state government

Source: Herr, 1971

Table 2

Potential Conflict Items across School Counselors,
Counselor Educators, and State Supervisors Relative to
Appropriateness of State Guidance Office Function

The development of certification requirements for counselors in community or junior colleges, if these are public institutions spanning grades 13 and 14

The review and approval of the qualifications of all applicants for counselors' certification

The development of counselor education programs in colleges and universities

The approval of the content and structure of proposed counselor education programs in college and universities

The supervision of counselor education programs for adherence to state standards

The coordination of all federal funds relating to guidance services

Source: Herr, 1971

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL COUNSELORS, STUDENT ENROLLMENTS AND RATIOS

ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE/JUNIOR AND HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS: STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND
RATIO OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS TO STUDENT ENROLLMENT

State	# Elementary School Counselors	# Middle/ Junior School Counselors	# High School Counselors	Total School Counselors	Total Student Enrollment	Ratio School Counselors Students
Arkansas	287	207	434	928	433,410	2/1000
Arizona	80	120	620	820	577,490	1/1000
California	1,369	2,215	1,107	9,644	4,078,743	2/1000
Connecticut		274	703	977	451,962	2/1000
Delaware	39	46	113	198	92,897	2/1000
Florida	1,117	646	1,136	2,899	1,559,507	2/1000
Georgia	140	325	785	1,250	1,084,462	1/1000
Hawaii	183		198	381	171,284	2/1000
Idaho	15	99	130	244	215,654	1/1000
Illinois				2,656	1,834,355	1/1000
Iowa	123	228	520	871	467,105	2/1000
Kansas	144	250	552	946	461,440	2/1000

State	# Elementary School Counselors	# Middle/ Junior School Counselors	# High School Counselors	Total School Counselors	Total Student Enrollment	Ratio School Counselors Students
Kentucky	200	200	400	800	640,000	1/1000
Louisiana	165	270	550	985	877,710	1/1000
Maine	110	100	240	450	208,943	2/1000
Maryland	275	1,075	1,350	2,700	619,000	4/1000
Massachusetts						
Minnesota	33		850	2,336	862,440	3/1000
Mississippi	37		125	893	640,874	1/1000
Montana	30		158	396	395,472	1/1000
Nebraska	50		375	231	154,412	1/1000
New Jersey	300	600	1,800	465	265,139	2/1000
New York	505	1,537	2,361	2,700	1,069,692	2/1000
N. Carolina	304	466	838	6,445	2,639,874	2/1000
N. Dakota	25	20	170	1,608	964,784	2/1000
Ohio	375	775	2,273	215	117,965	2/1000
				3,423	1,790,016	2/1000

State	# Elementary School Counselors	# Middle/ Junior School Counselors	# High School Counselors	Total School Counselors	Total Student Enrollment	Ratio School Counselors Students
Oklahoma	365	311	445	1,121	614,082	2/1000
Oregon	336	303	560	1,199	415,651	3/1000
Pennsylvania	537		1,855	2,392	1,513,203	1/1000
Rhode Island	83		262	345	105,000	3/1000
S. Carolina	294	308	419	1,021	412,209	2/1000
Texas	2,500	800	2,700	6,000	3,195,000	2/1000
Vermont	63	115	169	347	99,130	4/1000
Virginia	197	536	1,060	1,793	940,693	2/1000
Washington				1,245	721,408	2/1000
W. Virginia	53	150	293	496	357,324	1/1000
Wisconsin	425		1,125	1,550	757,553	2/1000
Wyoming	24	41	86	151	--	--

APPENDIX D

STATE GUIDANCE CONSULTANTS DIRECTORY

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFS

FIELD CONSULTANTS

ARIZONA (unconfirmed)

Mr. Randy Eubanks, Guidance Specialist
Arizona State Department of Education
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 255-4810

CALIFORNIA

Dr. Mary Weaver, Manager
School Climate Unit
California State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 323-0561

Mr. Lanny Berry, School Counseling
Consultant
Mr. Joe Cunha, School Counseling Consultant
Mr. Stan Greene, School Counseling
Consultant
Mr. Paul Peters, School Counseling
Consultant
Mr. James Rollings, School Counseling
Consultant
Mr. Lee Sheldon, School Counseling
Consultant
Mr. Milt Wilson, School Counseling
Consultant

COLORADO

Mr. Jeff Siefried, Program Manager
Special Programs
State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education
Centennial Building
1313 Sherman Street
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 866-2335

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFS

FIELD CONSULTANTS

CONNECTICUT

Dr. Allen Fossbender, Consultant
Bureau of Special Education and
Pupil Personnel Services
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06145
(203) 566-2284

DELAWARE

Mr. Clifton Hutton, State Supervisor
Guidance/Pupil Personnel Services
State Department of Public Instruction
The Townsend Building
PO Box 1402
Dover, Delaware 19901
(302) 736-4885

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Nathaniel E. Hill, Director
DC Public Schools
Division of Student Services
Counseling Branch
415 12th Street, Room 906W
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 724-4185

Dr. Dorothy E. Jenkins, Consultant

FLORIDA

Mr. Don Darling, Administrator
Student Services Section
Florida Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(904) 488-8974

Ms. Billie Jackson, Guidance Consultant
K - 12

Mr. Dale Ake, Vocational Education
Consultant

Mr. Bob Smith, Occupational Specialist

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFSFIELD CONSULTANTSGEORGIA

Mr. O. C. Hill, Coordinator
Guidance, Counseling, Career Development
Georgia Department of Education
1852 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
(404) 6562600

Mr. Ray Bouchillon, Career Development
Consultant
Ms. Lynda Harper, Consultant to Elementary
and Middle School Guidance
Ms. Billie Sherrod, Consultant to
Guidance and Counseling in
Secondary Education

HAWAII

Ms. Nancy Yuen, Specialist (unconfirmed)
Guidance and Counseling
Hawaii Department of Education
941 Hind
Iuka Drive
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821
(808) 373-2487

IDAHO

Dr. Tom Trotter, Consultant
Guidance/Counseling/Testing
Idaho Department of Education
Len B. Jordan Building
650 West State Street
Boise, Idaho 83720
(208) 334-3300 or 2113

ILLINOIS (No consultant spends 50% or more time on school counseling consultation)

Ms. Sheryl Poggel, Coordinator
Special Education and Pupli Personnel Services
Illinois State Department of Education
100 N 1st Street
Springfield, Ill 62777
(217) 782-6601

Mr. Lynn Troute, Career Guidance Specialist

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFSFIELD CONSULTANTSINDIANA

Dr. Stephen Davis, Coordinator
Student Services, Division of Research
Indiana Department of Education
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317) 927-0241

IOWA

Mr. Giles Smith, Chief (retiring in Jan. 1986)
Guidance Services Section
Department of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-3874

Mr. Jim Forsyth, Consultant to Guidance
and Counseling

Mr. Ed Ranney, Consultant to Guidance
and Counseling

KANSAS

Mr. Tom Henley, Education Program Specialist
Education Assistance
Kansas State Department of Education
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, Kansas 66612
(913) 296-4926

Ms. Cheryl Henderson, Program Specialist
Vocational Guidance and Counseling

KENTUCKY

Dr. Gary Steinhilber, Unit Director
Guidance Services
State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Tower, Room 205
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
(502) 568-3678

Mr. Ken Draut, State Consultant to
Secondary Schools

Ms. Debbie Lewis, Consultant to Elementary
School Guidance

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFSFIELD CONSULTANTSLOUISIANA

Mr. Barry Solar, Section Chief
Guidance and Counseling Services
Louisiana State Department of Education
PO Box 94064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9064
(504) 342-3473

Mr. Joseph Cotton, Supervisor of Guidance
and Counseling

Ms. Judith T. London, Supervisor of
Guidance and Counseling

MAINE

Ms. Betty McLaughlin, Guidance Consultant
State Department of Education and
Cultural Services
State House, Station #23
Augusta, Maine 04333
(207) 289-2033

MARYLAND

Dr. George C. Malless, Specialist
Guidance and Counseling
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2595
(301) 659-2433

MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Tim Dunn, Specialist
Guidance and Counseling
Student, Community, and Adult Services
Massachusetts State Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, Massachusetts 02169
(617) 770-7580

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFSFIELD CONSULTANTS

MICHIGAN (No consultant spends 50% or more time on school counseling consultation)

Ms. Claudette Nelson, Supervisor
Student Support Program
Michigan Department of Education
PO Box 3008
Lansing, Michigan 48940
(517) 373-6066

MINNESOTA

Ms. Joleen Durkin, Manager
Pupil Personnel Services
Minnesota State Department of Education
995 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(612) 296-4080

Dr. Diane Miller, Guidance and Counseling
Specialist

MISSISSIPPI

Mr. Clyde Hatten, Coordinator of Guidance
Mississippi State Department of Education
PO Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205
(601) 359-3467 or 3559

Mr. Rex Pouncey, Chapter I Monitor
K-12 Guidance

MISSOURI

Mr. Miles Beachboard, Director
Vocational/Guidance Services
Missouri State Department of Education
PO Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65105
(314) 751-6075

Dr. William Brandt, Supervisor of Guidance
Services

Mrs. Jackie Colemann, Supervisor of
Guidance Services

Ms. Iva Presberry, Supervisor of Guidance
Services

Dr. Marlon Starr, Assistant Director
Guidance Services

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFS

FIELD CONSULTANTS

MONTANA

Dr. Judy Birch, Guidance Specialist
Vocational Guidance Services
Office of Public Instruction, Montana VIEW
State Capitol Building
Helena, Montana 59620
(406) 444-5663

NEBRASKA

Mr. Roger Hudson, Director
Curriculum and Student Personnel Services
Nebraska State Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509
(402) 471-2446

Dr. Evelyn Lavaty, Consultant to Guidance
and Counseling Services

NEVADA

Mr. Bill Abrams, Coordinator
Basic Education
Nevada Department of Education
Capitol Complex
400 West King Street
Carson City, Nevada 89710
(702) 885-3136

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dr. James V. Carr, Consultant
Vocational Guidance
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 271-2452

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFSFIELD CONSULTANTSNEW JERSEY

Ms. Shirley Morton, Specialist
Career/Vocational Guidance and Counseling
New Jersey Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 292-5850

NEW MEXICO

Ms. Carol Schwendmann, Supervisor
Guidance and Counseling
New Mexico Department of Education
State Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-2786
(505) 827-6562

Ms. Jeanne Knight, Consultant to Elementary
and Secondary Guidance

NEW YORK

Mr. John Soja, Associate Supervisor
Bureau of Pupil Services
State Education Department
Room 362, EBA
Albany, New York 12234
(518) 474-6943

NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. John Schmidt, Coordinator
Guidance and Counseling Services
North Carolina State Department of
Public Instruction
Education Building, Room 539
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
(919) 733-4396

Ms. Carrie Garner, Consultant to Secondary
Guidance and Counseling
Mr. Jack Knox, Consultant to Middle/Junior
High Guidance and Counseling
Ms. Laura Swanson, Consultant to Elementary
Guidance and Counseling

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFS

FIELD CONSULTANT

NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. Dennis Steele, Supervisor
 Vocational Guidance
 North Dakota Department of Education
 State Capitol Building, 15th Floor
 Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
 (705) 224-3196

OHIO

Dr. Edwin A. Whitfield, Associate Director
 Division of Guidance and Counseling
 Ohio Department of Education
 65 South Front Street, Room 719
 Columbus, Ohio 43215
 (614) 466-4590

Mr. Emmett Bobbitt, Consultant
 Mr. John L. Chatman, Consultant
 Mr. Michael B. Cummings, Consultant
 Mr. Richard Green, Consultant
 Ms. Joan M. Hanson, Consultant
 Ms. Wanda L. Harewood, Elementary
 Guidance and Counseling

OKLAHOMA

Dr. George Cheek, Administrator
 Guidance and Counseling
 Oklahoma Department of Education
 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard
 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
 (405) 521-2426

Dr. Roy Allen, VIEW Coordinator
 Ms. Jeanie Banks, Career Education
 Mr. Lyndol Jones, Coordinator of
 Guidance
 Mr. Tom Hollingsworth, Vocational
 Guidance Coordinator
 Mr. Jim King, Coordinator of Guidance
 Mr. Frank Nochols, Coordinator of
 Guidance

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFSFIELD CONSULTANTSOREGON

Dr. Les Adkins, Director
Division of Student Services and
Special Education
Oregon State Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway
Salem, Oregon 97310
(503) 378-3596

Dr. Les Martin, Specialist in Guidance
and Counseling

Dr. Don Perkins, Specialist in Student
Activities and Vocational Guidance

PENNSYLVANIA

Dr. John Meerback, Chief
Division of Student Services
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126
(717) 783-6777

RHODE ISLAND

Dr. Arthur Tartaglione, State Coordinator
Guidance and Counseling
Rhode Island Department of Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908
(401) 277-2691

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Robert Moore, Unit Coordinator
of Guidance
Office of General Education
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 758-2652

 DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFS

 FIELD CONSULTANTS

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. Gene Fracek, Director and Coordinator
Curriculum and Guidance
Division of Education
Richard F. Kneip Building
700 N. Illinois Street
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
(605) 773-4747 or 3293

TENNESSEE

Ms. Gloria Matta, Director
Guidance Services
State Department of Education
132 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
(615) 741-2851

TEXAS

Mr. John Lucas, Program Director
Texas Department of Education
Division of Guidance Services
201 East Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 463-9498

Mr. Charles Merrill, Education
Guidance
Specialist I
Ms. Sue Milhalik, Chief Consultant

UTAH

Dr. R. Russell Whitaker, Guidance Specialist
Utah Office of Education, Vocational Office
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 533-5572

Dr. Lynn Jensen, Vocational
Guidance Specialist

DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFSFIELD CONSULTANTSVERMONT

Ms. Shirley Reid, Consultant
Guidance and Health Services
Vermont Department of Education
State Office Building
Montpelier, Vermont 05602
(802) 828-3111

VIRGINIA

Virginia Department of Education
PO Box 60
Richmond, Virginia 23216
(804) 225-2069

Dr. Don S. Ayers, Secondary School
Guidance Supervisor
Ms. Jan L. Harris, Middle School Guidance
Supervisor
Ms. Libby Hoffman, Elementary Guidance
Supervisor

WASHINGTON

Mr. Jay Wood, Administrator
Program Development Section
Division of Vo-Tech & Adult Ed
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building, Mail Stop FG-11
Olympia, Washington 98504
(206) 753-2062

Ms. June Peck, Supervisor Pupil Personnel
Services

WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Roger Tittle, Coordinator
Counseling and Guidance
West Virginia Department of Education
Capitol Complex
Building 6, Room 337
Charleston, West Virginia 25305
(304) 348-7010

Mrs. Terri Wilson, Unit Coordinator
Student Support Services

 DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS/CHIEFS

 FIELD CONSULTANTS

WISCONSIN

Dr. Richard Roth, Director
 Wisconsin State Department of Public
 Instruction
 Bureau of Pupil Personnel Services
 PO Box 7841
 125 South Weber Street
 Madison, Wisconsin 53707
 (608) 266-9677

Mrs. Pam Wilson, Consultant to Guidance
 and Counseling

WYOMING

Dr. Richard Granum, Consultant
 Pupil Personnel Services
 Wyoming Department of Education
 Hathaway Building
 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
 (307) 777-6144

REFERENCES

- Aubrey, R.F. (1982). A house divided: Guidance and counseling in the 20th century America. Personnal and Guidance Journal, 61, 198-204.
- Aubrey, R.F. (1983). The odyssey of counseling and images of future. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62, 78-82.
- Babbie, E.R. (1973). Survey research methods. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Bacharach, S.B., & Mitchell, S.M. (1983). The sources of dissatisfaction in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19, 101-128.
- Bowditch, J.L., & Buono, A.F. (1982). Quality of work life assessment: A survey based approach. Boston, Massachusetts: Auburn House Publishing Co.
- Brief, A.P., & Aldag, R.J. (1976). Correlates of role indices. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 469-472.
- Burck, H.D., & Peterson, G.W. (1975) Needed: More evaluation not reserarch. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53, 563-569.
- Burke, A.J. (1951). Financing public schools in the United States. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Caldwell, D.F., & O'Reilly, C.A. (1982). Task perceptions and job satisfaction: A question of causality. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 361-369.
- Camp, D. (1964). The guidance worker in the state department of education. (Counsel for Basic Education) Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office. FS 5.225:25041.
- Council for Basic Education. (1982). The American High School: Time For Reform. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.

- Council of Chief State School Officers. (1960). Responsibilities of state departments of education for pupil personnel services: A policy statement. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Cunningham, L.L. (1985). Leaders and leadership: 1985 and beyond. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 17-20.
- Dentler, R.A. (1984). Ambiguities in state-local relations. Education and Urban Society, 16, 145-164.
- Dessler, G. (1979). Human behavior: Improving performance at work. Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing Co.
- DeVoe, M.W., & McClam, T. (1982). Service Coordination: The school counselor. The School Counselor, 32, 23-29.
- Dustin, D., & Ehly, S. (1984). Skills for effective consultation. The School Counselor, 32, 23-29.
- Educating Americans for the 21st century. (1983). Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.
- Erpenbach, W.J. (1977). State supervision and counselor educators: Can we get our act together? Counselor Education and Supervision, 16, 305-309.
- Erpenbach, W.J., & Perrone, P.A. (1985). School counselors--Using power and influence to better meet student needs. Counseling and Human Development, 17(8), 1-10.
- Eye, G.G. (1975). Assigned power and ascribed leadership. Journal of Educational Research, 68, 230-234.
- Fitzpatrick, G.M. (1967). State supervisors and the professional literature. Counselor Education and Supervision, 7, 78.
- Gade, E.M., & Zaccaria, J.S. (1966). Topical entries and institutional sources of articles in Counselor Education and Supervision, volumes 1-4, 1961-65. Counselor Education and Supervision, 5, 221-225.
- Geoffroy, K.E., & Duncan, J.A. (1971). A factor analysis of the role of the state supervisor of guidance services. Counselor Education and Supervision, 10, 138-145.
- Glennen, R.E. (1984). Is counseling's bottom line at the top? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62, 604-606.

- Greenspan, M. (1985). Perceived leader behavior, individual dogmatism, and job satisfaction. High School Journal April/May, 405-406.
- Grieder, C., & Romine, S. (1965). American education: An introduction to the teaching profession. (3rd ed.) New York: Ronald Press.
- Hackman, J.R., & Lawler, E.E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 259-286.
- Heddesheimer, J. (1978). Federal, state, and local coordination and supervision of guidance and counseling programs. In F. Burtnett (Ed.), The status of guidance and counseling in the nation's schools (pp. 243-251). Washington, DC: American Personnel and Guidance Association.
- Henderson, A.T. (1986). Chapter 2: For better or worse? Phi Delta Kappan, 67(8), 597-602.
- Herr, E.L. (1971). National perspectives on state guidance office functions. Counselor Education and Supervision, 10, 209-218.
- Herr, E.L. (1979). Guidance and counseling in the schools: Perspectives on the past, present, and future. Falls Church, Virginia: American Personnel and Guidance Association.
- Herr, E.L. (1985). AACD: An association committed to unity through diversity. Journal of Counseling and Development, 63, 395-404.
- Herzberg, F. (1976). The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human. Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Heyden, D., & Pohlmann, N. (1981). Accountability and evaluation: Necessary for the survival of guidance programs? NASSP Bulletin, 65, 60-63.
- Hill, G.E. (1974). Management and improvement of guidance (2nd. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hoyt, K.B. (1966). The influence of the state guidance supervisor on the future of vocational education. In N.C. Gysbers Proceedings National Seminar of Vocational Guidance. US Office of Education, Department of Health Education and Welfare, Washington, DC.

- Humphreys, J.A., & Traxler, A.E. (1954). Guidance services. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Jackson, S.E. (1983). Participation in decision making as a strategy for reducing job related strain. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 3-19.
- Kasl, S.V., & French, J.R.P., Jr. (1962). The effects of occupational status on physical and mental health. Journal of Social Issues, 18, 67-89.
- Kurpius, D. (1984). Consultation. The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Newsletter, 44(1), 11.
- Lakein, A. (1973). How to get control of your time and your life. New York: David McKay.
- Lewis, J.D. (1983). Guidance program evaluation: How to do it. The School Counselor, 31, 111-119.
- Male, R.A. (1982). Counsultation as an intervention strategy for school counselors. The School Counselor, 30, 25-31.
- McKee, M., & Murphy, P.J. (June, 1984). Adult education administrators' satisfaction with their work life. Lifelong Learning, pp. 12-28.
- McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (1984). Research in education. Boston: Little Brown, & Co.
- Minkoff, H.B., & Terres, C.K. (1985). ASCA perspectives: Past, present and future. Journal of Counseling and Development, 63, 424-427.
- Myrick, R.D. (1977). Consultation as counselor instruction. Washington, DC: American School Counselor Association.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.
- National Data Book and Guide to Sources. (1984). Statistical abstract of the United States, 1985 (105th ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- Nejedlo, R. (1983). Tools of creative leadership. The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 44(2), 3.

- Nejedlo, R. (1984). Unleashing the creative leader in you. The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 44(3), 3.
- Ornstein, A. (1985). The national reports on education: Implications for directions and aims. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 21, 58-64.
- Partin, R.L. (1983). Time mangement for school counselors. The School Counselor, 30, 280-284.
- Ruffin, J.E. (1984). The anxiety of meaninglessness. Journal of Counseling and Development, 63, 40-42.
- Schmidt, J.J. (1984). School counseling: Professional directions for the future. The School Counselor, 31, 385-392.
- Schmidt, J.J., & Barret, R.L. (1983). "Who's in charge? School counseling supervision in North Carolina. Counselor Education and Supervision, 23, 109-116.
- Sheridan, J.E., & Vredenburg, D.J. (1979). Structural models of leadership influence in a hospital organization. Academy of Management Journal, 22, 6-21.
- Shertzer, B., & Stone, S.C. (1974). Fundamentals of counseling (2nd. ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sieber, S. (1975). The requirements of a national educational R & D system. Educational Research, 5, 306.
- Spencer, D.G., & Steers, R.M. (1981). Performance as a moderator of job satisfaction-turnover relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66, 511-514.
- Stiltner, B. (1978). Needs assessment: A first step. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 12, 239-246.
- Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (1983). Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States.
- Tharenou, P., & Harker, P. (1982). Organizational correlates of employee self-esteem. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 797-805.
- Tiedt, S.W. (1966). The role of the federal government in education. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tofler, A. (1970). Future shock. New York: Bantam Books/Random House.

- Twentieth Century Fund Task Report on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. (1983). Making the grade. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.
- Udell, G. (1966). Laws relating to vocational education and agricultural extension work (compiled). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Venn, G. (1964). Man, education, and work. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Wantz, R.A., Corvin, S.A., & Hollis, J.W. (1985). The role and function of the counseling and guidance staff of state departments of education: A descriptive study. Counselor Education and Supervision, 24, 264-274.
- Warner, R.O. (1969). Pupil personnel services in the 50 states: A comprehensive study. New York: Chronicle Guidance Publications.
- Watts, W.R. (1981). What can one expect from the guidance directors? NASSP Bulletin, 65, 34-38.
- Wheless, V.E., Wheless, L.R., & Howard, R.D. (1983). An analysis of the contribution of participative decision making and communication with supervisor as predictors of job satisfaction. Research in Higher Education, 18, 145-160.
- Wilds, E.H. (1936). The foundations of modern education. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.
- Young, P., & Davis, B. (1983). The applicability of Herzberg's dual factor theory(ies) for public school superintendents. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 16, 59-66.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Margaret L. Click was born May 20, 1942, to Forest and Grace Lawton, in Turtle Creek, Pennsylvania. She attended Milford Mill High School in Baltimore County, Maryland, and graduated in June, 1960.

In September, 1960, she entered Knox College in Galesburg, Illinois. She received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in biology in June, 1964.

From 1964 to 1968, she was a science and mathematics teacher in Baltimore, Maryland; Galesburg, Illinois; and San Pablo, California. She began her master's at the University of California (Berkeley campus) in 1967.

In June, 1968, she moved to Sparta, New Jersey, where she taught 7th and 8th grade science. She entered East Stroudsburg State College and received her master's in genetics in June, 1972.

In 1973, she moved to Umatilla, Florida and began to teach biology and chemistry at Umatilla High School. She received her certification in school counseling from Stetson University in August, 1980.


In 1981, she was admitted to the doctoral program at the University of Florida where she completed her Ph.D. in August, 1986.

Margaret L. Click is currently married to Dewitt Ernest Click and has two daughters, Doris and Barbara; and three grandchildren, Bryan, Jennifer, and T.J.


I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Dr. Robert B. Myrick, Chairman
Professor of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



Dr. Janet Larsen
Associate Professor of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Dr. Robert Jester
Associate Professor of Foundations of Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 1986


Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School